DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 065 CS 205 786

AUTHOR	Stahlecker, James: And Others
TITLE	National Writing Project Report. Evaluation of the Bay Area Writing Project. Technical Report.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Berkeley. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	79
NOTE	91p.: For related documents see CS 205 779-786. A number of pages in appendix may be marginally legible.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education: Higher Education: *Inservice Teacher Education: *Program Effectiveness: *Program Evaluation: *Teacher Improvement: *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS	*Bay Area Writing Project: *National Writing Project

ABSTRACT

Prepared as part of the evaluation of the Bay Area Writing Project (BAWP), this report examines the National Writing Project (NWP) network, a group of teacher training projects designed to replicate the core model of the BAWP. The information provided in this report is divided into three sections. The first section summarizes information regarding site offerings. The second section presents assessment data on teacher change as a result of the writing projects. The third section outlines the student assessment studies conducted at 11 of the National Writing Project sites. Appendixes provide results of a survey of NWP sites, evaluations submitted from NWP sites, and data on positive evaluations made by participants of NWP program offerings. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED191065

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EVALUATION OF THE BAY AREA WRITING PROJECT

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Technical Report

Funded By
The Carnegie Corporation

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Michael Scrivens

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1979

Evaluation Directed by
Michael Scriven
Director, Evaluation Institute
University of San Francisco
San Francisco, CA 94117

CS205786

This report represents only ONE component of the total Evaluation of the Bay Area Writing Project. The other Evaluation reports are available through the BAWP office. For an up-to-date list, including current prices, write

James R. Gray, Director
Bay Area Writing Project
School of Education
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

NATIONAL WRITING PROJECT REPORT

BY

James Stahlecker Susan Thomas Patti Watson
Catharine Keech

For the Evaluation of the Bay Area Writing Project
Written under the direction of Michael Scriven

Completed September, 1979

NATIONAL WRITING PROJECT REPORT

Summary of Findings and Conclusions

This report examines the National Writing Project Network. Information included in this report was gathered in a variety of ways. The BAWP Evaluation Unit gathered data in the following ways: 1) a survey questionnaire was sent to all site directors to gather information regarding site offerings and project funding; 2) assessment information was solicited to gather on-site evaluation data of student writing progress and teacher change as a result of the project; 3) telephone interviews were conducted to clarify information and/or to further develop information provided by the site director; and 4) a limited number of on-site interviews were conducted in efforts to gather more complete and detailed information from directors. In addition, teacher assessment information collected by BAWP central staff as part of the interim reports of the national sites was included for use in this report.

The information is divided into three sections in this report. Section I summarizes information gathered by questionnaires regarding site offerings. Section II overviews assessment data of teacher change as a result of the writing project, and Section III outlines the student assessment studies conducted by 11 of the National Writing Project sites.

Section I: Results of Survey of 67 NWP Site Directors.

Wide variation was found among NWP sites in number of teachers served, number of training programs offered, and the organization, length and content of programs. Major differences occured in the following areas:

--- Basis for Participation in Summer Institute:
Original BAWP model: Expert teacher identified by recommendation and hearsay. Interview with project director who confirmed appointment.

Variations: Some sites solicit applications by general open announcement; individual or group interviews are a major part of screening and selection, together with written statements and personal references named in teacher applications.

Where applicants are geographically dispersed, application and interview may take place entirely by mail. Alternatively, the director(s) may tour their state to conduct individual interviews at applicant's location.

Conclusions: Interviews were seen by all sites as crucial to dynamics of the Summer Institute, and useful for orienting future participants. In one case where teachers were interviewed by other than the site directors, directors reported some dissatisfaction among participants and regretted having lost that opportunity to prepare teachers for the summer experience. A number of sites, however, reported variations on the selection model, and generally reported the success of that adaptation.

--- Format and Contents of Summer Institute

No major differences were found between the BAWP model and NWP offerings. A course, generally of five weeks, may be extended by several days or a week to allow additional program possibilities, including such activities as presentations to school administrators, local community leaders, work with students, school program planning, etc.

Components aways covered include: writing for peer group feedback and presentations of teaching ideas. Methods of scheduling, kinds of assignments for teachers' writing groups and content of presentations vary from year to year and site to site. The number of visiting speakers also varies.

A "core curriculum" of topics, issues, and instructional emphases from the BAWP Summer Institutes is often repeated at other sites, but additional topics and teaching methods vary depending on the site. Although BAWP exports many Teacher Consultants to other National sites, reciprocal visits by outstanding teachers of other sites has not yet become common.

--- School-Year Inservices

82% of sites provide some form of school-year inservice after the Summer Institutes.

Offerings may vary from one-session (1 to 6 hour) workshops to sequences of presentations, including from 6-9 sessions for a single district. The BAWP standard model of ten, 3-hour sessions is not commonly adopted by National sites, due to local limitations. Sessions may be presented on school sites, or elsewhere. Longer inservice programs may be staffed by a variety of visiting presentors (BAWP standard model) or be led entirely by one or more Summer Fellow working in the local school or district.

Limited funds or geographical isolation encourages the latter solution, with a single presentor often describing methods learned at the Summer Institute which he or she may not yet have applied in the classroom.

Section II: Results of 17 National Writing Project Reports Regarding Teacher Attitude and Behavior.

National Writing Project participants have consistently reported very enthusiastic ratings of the project as a whole. Evaluations submitted from the sites reveal that participants believe that their project experience has had a positive impact on their growth as teachers and as writers. The teachers generally feel that the techniques they learned from the project are applicable to their classes, and many report they plan to implement these new techniques when they return to their schools. Participants have responded more positively toward the writing/response groups than to any other component of the training program. Many teachers have reported that they expect their students to show improvement in writing skills as a result of their involvement with the project.

Project participants have criticized the coordination of Summer Fellows' presentations more than any other aspect of the workshop. Teachers report that they would like to be able to discuss one anothers' presentations more fully, claiming that peer feedback in this area would provide participants with suggestions for improving their material for delivery at school year inservices.

Recommendations:

The following recommendations are based on suggestions frequently made by National Writing Project participants.

— Group discussion and/or formal evaluation of participant presentations could be provided by Fellows or staff at NWP Summer Institutes.

— The summer program could include training or discussion of ways participants could make changes in the writing programs of their schools.

Section III: Results of National Writing Project Student Assessments.

The National Writing Project site directors were contacted by letter and by telephone if necessary, in attempts to obtain student assessment information, if such data had been collected by the site. Eleven sites indicated that such assessment had been conducted and submitted data summaries or final reports of the assessment to the BAWP Evaluation office. Those results follow.

--- Very few of the NWP sites have been involved in assessment of student writing progress. Reasons given include lack of funding and staff support and lack of expertise in designing and conducting an assessment.

--- The 11 sites which have conducted writing assessments used a wide range of study designs and data analyses and interpretations. Some of them reflect more careful planning and more credible outcomes than others.

--- Among the more carefully-planned are three which report positive student impact attributed to NWP teachers: Rutgers, Colorado and BAWP. Each of these sites employed a different design and different techniques of data analysis.

--- Only two sites, Texas Hill Country and BAWP, engaged in basic research studies, i.e. examination of writing practices rather than assessments of writing products or outcomes.

--- Only three sites, Redwood (California), BAWP and Oregon, used analytic reading techniques. Each one chose different types of items or traits to analyze, in addition to scoring writing samples holistically.

Recommendations:

--- Many sites have indicated a need for assistance in designing student writing assessments. More needs to be done within the NWP Network to share assessment ideas and expertise along with information about assessments already conducted.

--- Many of the studies reflected a very limited range of writing tasks, the most narrow example being use of a single topic, pre to post-test. Sites need to work harder to design writing tasks which will allow greater generalizability of findings and will draw more specifically upon the items in the NWP "core curriculum".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NATIONAL WRITING PROJECT REPORT

	page
A. Summary of Findings for Sections I, II and III	1
B. Overview of National Writing Project Report	1
C. Presentation of Data	
I. Results of Site Director's Questionnaire	4
1. The Questionnaire	4
2. Summer Institute a. Number of sessions which have been offered at each site b. Demographics of past summer sessions c. Soliciting participants and the interview procedure d. Structure of the summer program e. Content of the summer program	6
3. School Year Inservice a. Number of inservices offered at each site b. Demographics of inservice offerings in 1978-79 c. Structure of the school year inservice	21
II. Results of National Writing Project Reports of Teacher Response	27
1. Summary of Data Sources 2. Attitude Towards Workshop Experience 3. Impact on Teaching Ability and on Students 4. Changes in Teaching Techniques 5. Follow-up Activities 6. Suggestions for Improvement	
III. National Writing Project Student Writing Assessment	39
1. Introduction 2. Descriptions of Student Writing Assessment	
D. Appendices	
A: Survey of National Writing Project Sites	77
B: Evaluations Submitted from NWP Sites	81
C: Item Analysis of Participant Evaluation of NWP Program Offerings	82

OVERVIEW OF THE
NATIONAL WRITING PROJECT REPORT

NWP Network

In November of 1978, the National Writing Project came into existence with the publication of the first national newsletter. At that time, forty-one sites were operating in twenty-four states, funded partially or totally by the National Endowment for the Humanities gifts and matching grants. An additional 15 sites were funded for 1979-80.

The NEH also funded the newsletter and provided a small grant for inter-site visits and meetings of national site directors to exchange information on policies and practices at the various sites. James Gray, founder/head of the Bay Area Writing Prcject was named director of the National Network.

NWP Sites: The Model and its Variations

A National Writing Project site, by definition, offers teacher training programs designed to replicate the core model of the Bay Area Writing Project. The major components which define the BAWP model are:

--- The Summer Institute. Teachers from grade level K-13 are invited to participate in intensive workshop training, during which they write for peer response groups, make presentations of their own best teaching practices, and hear and discuss presentations from visiting speakers. The purpose of the Institute is to train a core group of teachers as consultants and coordinators who will lead school-year inservice programs in local districts and schools.

--- The School-Year Inservice Program. There is greater variation in the length, the format, and the content of inservices offered by various writing projects than in the offerings of the different Summer Institutes. Typical formats include day-long workshops, ten-week or 30-hour programs, and summer sessions of varying lengths. Consultants trained in the Summer Invitational Institutes make presentations to groups of teachers at the school sites.

--- Evaluation and Assessment. Almost every NWP site has incorporated an evaluation plan of some kind to measure outcomes of the training program.

Certain similarities in the format and content of the two primary components --- the Summer Institute and the School-Year Inservice --- seem required of National Writing Projects almost by definition. It is not clear, however, which, if any, requirements are immutable. One or two site directors surveyed suggested that limited funds may require cancelling the Summer Institute in 1980 but said that the Project at that site would not necessarily cease to function. Instead, directors planned to continue sending past Summer Fellows as consultants to local districts. No policy decision has yet been made to determine the status of such sites as members of the NWP Network.

Less radical variations among the sites exist in almost every part of the model, from methods of funding, selection of Summer Institute participants, selection and assignment of consultants to inservice leadership, selection and funding of school-year inservice sites, organization and use of time both in the Summer Institute and in the school inservices, and kinds of evaluation and assessment used.

In addition, longer established sites tend to generate spin-off programs --- additions to the basic model, which become possible primarily at well funded, securely tenured and more experienced sites. NWP site variations described in more detail in the following report include the following:

--- Differences in number, length, format and content of training programs offered by NWP sites:
Described in Section I of this report, based on a survey of 67 NWP directors.

--- Similarities in responses of teachers to the training programs at all sites:
Section II of this report, based on program evaluations from 17 NWP sites, describes commonly recorded praise or suggestions from teachers in the programs.

--- Descriptions of models of assessment of student writing performance, with summaries of results:
Section III of this report presents brief descriptions of writing assessment results from 11 NWP sites.

It is not possible on the basis of the data to determine with great precision, the extent to which differences in site management --- whether in amounts of money spent or in program format, length, or content --- effect major or minor changes in the impact of the training program. To some extent, it seems likely that differences --- where they reflect adaptations to local needs --- enhance the possibility of project impact on teachers or students. Where possible, the following report includes observations and informal evaluations gleaned from participants, directors, visiting speakers, or BAWP central staff, which weigh the relative merits of specific innovations inspired by different project experiences and the various compromises dictated by funding or geographical constraints.

SECTION I

RESULTS OF SITE DIRECTORS' QUESTIONNAIRE

INTRODUCTION

In order to gain a better understanding of the vast dissemination of the Bay Area Writing Project, the Evaluation staff surveyed the site directors of the National Writing Network, examining their similarities and their differences with BAWP. Fifty-two (52) National Writing Project directors contributed information about adaptations of the BAWP model they had found necessary, given the needs of different populations across the nation. The survey also asked directors questions about funding, and their projects' plans and potential for continuance. That information is summarized in The Cost Report. The present report describes the shape and content of the training programs offered at National Writing Project sites as reported by the NWP site directors.

In addition to the survey by questionnaire, NWP directors were canvassed for reports on evaluations conducted at the sites. Descriptions of reported project impact and methods of evaluation at NWP sites are included in parts II and III of this report.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The National Director's Survey examines the program content at various national sites and asks questions regarding expenditures necessary to keep each site in operation. In particular, questions about programming focused on four components of a project.

1) Summer Institute
2) School Year Inservice
3) Other training offered by NWP sites
4) Content of Training Programs

ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

A total of 67 questionnaires were sent out during the summer months of 1979 to site directors at each of the National Writing sites. Questionnaires were coded by site for computer analysis to ensure anonymity. Sites which had not returned the questionnaire within three weeks time were contacted by telephone. Generally, the call prompted individuals to return the questionnaire, and no telephone interviews were necessary.

Three sites surveyed were not yet in their first year of operation or planning. These were dropped from the sample, reducing the number of sites discussed in this report to 64. Of those sites, a questionnaire return rate of 81% was reached.

THE SUMMER INSTITUTE

As shown in Table 1A the Summer Institute is the primary training program offered by all National Writing Project sites, except one first year site which had not presented its first Summer Institute at the time of the questionnaire.

---

insert Tables 1A and 1B about here

Of the 52 respondents to the National Director's survey, eleven (11) reported that they were offering Summer Institutes for the third year, 22 were in their second year of institutes, and 19 were offering their first Summer Institute in 1979. The second major training program, the school-year inservice, has been fully established by all third-year programs, and by nearly all first and second year programs. About half of the third year sites have instituted additional training programs, listed in Table 1B, with fewer of these offered by first and second year sites.

The number of teachers attending Summer Institutes varies from site to site and from year to year, although typically a summer enrollment is between 15 and 30 participants. Table 2 summarizes the mean number of teachers trained in Summer Institutes to date.

---

insert Table 2 about here

TABLE 1A TRAININC PROGRAMS OFFERED BY SITES

	1st year sites	2nd year sites	3rd year sites	Percentage of Total Sites
Summer Instit.	All but 1	100%	100%	99.9%
Summer Open	15.8%	13.6%	27.3%	17.3%
School-year Inservices	89.5%	90.9%	100%	92.3%
Other Training Activities (see Table 1B)	21.1%	36.4%	45.5%	32.7%

TABLE 1B OTHER TRAINING ACTIVITIES

Activity	No. of sites
Graduate coursework offerings on teaching of writing	3
Conference for University faculty - faculty writing workshop at University	2
Saturday school-year conferences - curriculum development and writing	
School Improvement Plan school consultation	1
Run 3-week writing course for school teachers during the year	1
Young Writer's Conference Institute	1
Parent's Writing Nite at public school	1
Presentations for State Board of Education	1
Half-day introductory programs for teachers and administrators	1
Direct classroom support with project teachers during school year	1
Special campus conferences, panels, etc.	1
Create materials for undergraduate writing center	1

TABLE 2 NUMBER OF TEACHERS TRAINED IN NWP SUMMER INSTITUTES TO DATE

	First year Sites	Second year Sites	Third year Sites
Average	20.7	46.7	86.7
Range	14 - 30	29 - 89	36 - 200
Number Reporting	19	22	11

PRE-INSTITUTE SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

All but two of the national directors surveyed reported that they solicit recommendations for participants in the Summer Institute. The two sites which reported no formal procedure for soliciting recommendations said that participants initiated contact in response to Project advertising, and were then screened in a formal application with or without interviews. Table 3 summarizes the range of people from whom recommendations are solicited by sites using the "Invitational" model.

---

insert Table 3 about here

Many sites used more than one source for recommendations, including letters from co-teachers, principals and students, compiling a "package of recommendations" for promising teachers.

All but three sites reported conducting interviews before final selection of Summer Institute Fellows. Of the three sites which did not conduct interviews, one identified this oversight as "an identifiably weak part of the Institute". He explained that notification of funding came too late to allow time for interviews. A second site reported that geographic size prohibited interviews, but that letters of application and statements of purpose were carefully examined in selecting participants. A third project had few enough applications that participation was granted to all teachers who wished to come, so that selection by interview was unnecessary.

As seen in Table 4, directors may request assistance in interviewing from a variety of people, although a majority of site directors reported that they played the primary role themselves.

TABLE 3 SOURCES OF RECOMMENDATIONS IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENTS

Total Number of Respondents:

Each respondent marked as many items as were appropriate

	No. of Respondents Choosing Item	Percent of Total Possible Respondents
School Districts	12	23%
Co-teacher	10	19%
Teaching Superior (Dept. Chair)	10	19%
Administrators	15	29%
Students	2	4%
Former Fellows	2	4%
Principals	15	29%
Curriculum Supervisors	3	6%
Anyone	1	2%
University Faculty	2	4%
County Staff	3	6%
State Consultant in English	1	2%
Self-referral	2	4%
Professional Association	1	2%

TABLE 4 INTERVIEWS

Total Number of Respondents: 52*

Program Directors	34	65%
District Officials and Program Directors	6	11%
Staff and Advisory Board	5	10%
District Personnel	3	6%
Advisory Board	1	2%
None Conducted	3	6%

*Each respondent marked one item only

---

insert Table 4 about here

Criteria used in selecting participants appear relatively consistent across sites and across years. As shown in Table 5, five major factors are important to a director's choice of participants:

---The applicant's reputation as a successful teacher of composition

---The applicant's apparent commitment to Project's goals: willingness to make presentations, willingness to become a consultant to other teachers

---The applicant's personality characteristics and intellectual ability

---The applicant's own statement of views on teaching composition, ability to express a strong position but apparent openness to new ideas

---Background factors: the applicant's role as representative of geographic, racial, social, professional groups, grade levels taught or special emphasis, so that Institute enrolls a wide range of applicants

---

insert Table 5 about here

Background factors might also include such things as the fact that the applicant's district agreed to pay the summer stipend, or that an applicant might have to leave to attend a summer wheat harvest.

The overwhelming focus of the Berkeley Summer Institute is to find teachers of proven excellence, with this criteria only rarely being outweighed by other considerations. Other sites, however, appear willing to weigh other factors more heavily, especially when they are trying to reach representative teachers from a large number of groups or geographic areas. There are good arguments made for

TABLE 5 INTERVIEW CRITERIA

Personality characteristics/Intellectual ability

N = 8 (3 blank)	N = 22	N = 19
First year 75%	Second year 41%	Third year 70%
Open to new ideas	Open to new ideas	Flexibility
Enthusiasm for teaching	Growth potential	Desire to improve teaching
Ability to interact well	Ability interact well	Openness to new ideas and others
		Diversity of interests

Quality as a teacher/reputation as successful in the teaching of composition

First year 63%	Second year 91%	Third year 80%
Dedicated teacher	Strong dedicated teacher	Position and experience
Highly recommended	Ability write curricula	Demonstrated excellence in teaching
Known as outstanding teacher	3 years teaching exper.	Recommendations
	Evidence of success	Master-teacher qualities

Commitment to the goals of the writing project

First year 50%	Second year 45%	Third year 60%
Willing to conduct inservice	Willing to write and demonstrate	Willing to do follow-up workshop
Potential as T/C	Potential as T/C	Willing to do inservice
Willing to make presentation	Willing to make presentation	Commitment to writing
	Articulation of presentation	

Representative of some demographic group

First year 13%	Second year 23%	Third year 20%
Range of age of participants	Commitment from district to pay $700 fee	Geographic representation of state
	Represent small and large areas	Grade level representation
	Represent elementary & secondary grades	Non-interference with summer wheat harvest
	Participant has support of district to go back to provide inservice	

Statement of views on the teaching of composition/statement of interest in project

First year 0%	Second year 9%	Third year 5%

Other

First year 25%	Second year 14%	Third year 40%
Participants' own writing samples	Past experience delivering inservice	Graduate hours for M.A.
	Professional involvement	Own writing sample
		Comments from pre-interview questionnaire

both of these emphases, which may also reflect an awareness of the amount of local talent available. More densely populated areas are more likely to yield large numbers of outstanding teachers year after year than more sparsely populated areas.

STRUCTURE OF THE SUMMER PROGRAM

Table 6 summarizes the number of hours per day and total length of the NWP summer programs. National sites vary in the length of training offered, often because of financial and/or geographic limitations. For instance, the program is more costly when participants come from a long distance away and have housing expenses throughout the Institute.

---

insert Table 6 about here

Table 7 shows the amount of variation possible in designing the summer programs. While some program directors gave no presentations during the Institute, others reported "personally leading" as much as one-fourth of the Institute. While participant writing is a central element to the Berkeley Summer Institute, accounting for one-third of participants'time, 41% of the respondents to the National Director's survey indicated that less than one-fourth of the time in their Summer Institute was devoted to writing by participants.

Insert Table 7 about here

One project, on the other hand, reported that fully half of participants' time was devoted to writing.

TABLE 6 NUMBER OF DAYS AND HOURS PER DAY IN NWP SUMMER INSTITUTES

	Number of hours	Number of days
Average	5.7	21.0
Range	4 - 8	13 - 30

TABLE 7 USES OF TIME IN NWP SUMMER INSTITUTES

(Percentages express portion of total scheduled time in Institute)

	Presentations by Participants	Presentations by Leaders of Institute	Presentations by "expert" Guests	Writing by Participants	Other *
Average	40%	10%	14%	26%	10%
Range	20 - 65%	0 - 25%	2 - 35%	0 - 50%	0 - 50%

* see Table 8

Participants gave teaching presentations at all Summer Institutes. These presentations serve two purposes. They directly instruct the other teacher participants in some new aspect of teaching composition. But, more importantly, they act as a trial-run for the presenter, who is in training to become a consultant to others during the coming school year. Observing these presentations, directors identify teaching ideas worth disseminating as well as find especially talented presenters.

In some cases, where geographically isolated teachers will return to their own locales to act as the only available consultant, the presentations provide teachers with a selection of ideas and methods of sharing them with other teachers. The participant presentations reflect the central philosophy of the project that teachers are the best qualified instructors of other teachers.

Forty-four percent (44%) of the respondents indicated that some time was spent during their Summer Institute in activities other than presentations and writing. These activities, as described by the national directors, are summarized in Table 8.

---

insert Table 8 about here

TABLE 8

ADDITIONAL USES OF SCHEDULED TIME
IN NWP SUMMER INSTITUTES

IN-CLASS ACTIVITIES	OUT-OF-CLASS ACTIVITIES
Reading of exemplary papers	Lunch
Planning inservices/presenting models of inservice	Journal writing
Holistic scoring	Library research
Feedback to presenters	Collecting films
Newspaper planning	Social activities
Daily business	Reading
Writing curricula	

CONTENTS OF THE SUMMER PROGRAM

The nine content items listed on the National Directors' Survey are common presentation topics in BAWP summer programs. Respondents were asked to indicate if the items were:
1)formally presented and discussed in session, 2)mentioned and/or discussed, but not formally presented, or 3) not mentioned or discussed. Table 9 outlines the responses of the NWP site directors.

---

insert Table 9 about here

As shown in that table, sites generally make the same key presentations made by BAWP in the Berkeley Summer Institute. In addition, sites have generated presentations about issues and/or concerns particular to their own areas and populations. The additional teaching techniques, issues and concerns frequently presented at NWP sites, but not included in the questionnaire options are summarized in Table 10.

---

insert Table 10 about here

TABLE 9 ISSUES AND/OR CONCERNS COMMONLY PRESENTED IN NWP PROGRAMS *

1 = Formally presented and discussed in session

2 = Mentioned and/or discussed, but not formally presented

3 = Not mentioned or discussed

	1	2	3
Increasing the number of different types of student writing	86%	14%	0%
Teaching writing as a process through prewriting activities	98%	2%	0%
Teaching writing as a process through rewriting activities	78%	22%	0%
Use of peer feedback groups	96%	4%	0%
Increasing the amount of in-class time devoted to writing	53%	45%	2%
Increasing the number of in-class writing assignments	61%	37%	2%
Increasing the number of audiences who read students' work	78%	20%	2%
Increasing exploratory writing (free writing, journals, etc.)	88%	12%	0%
Increasing the variety of writing topics	94%	6%	0%

* Percentages based on a total of 52 Site Director's responses

TABLE 10 ADDITIONS AND ADAPTATIONS TO THE SUMMER INSTITUTE FORMAT

FREQUENTLY PRESENTED TOPICS

Topics of Instruction

Spelling
Saturation reporting
Voice/person/point of view
Style in writing
Structure and organization
Audience analysis
Sentence combining
Mapping
Exposition
Proofing and editing
Student research writing
Writing across the curriculum
Writing K-13
Right/left brain activities
Linguistics and writing
Oral language and writing
Media and writing
Dramatics and writing
Music and writing
Reading and writing
Poetry and writing
Grammar and writing
Elbow's writing without teachers

Theories

Models of discourse
Child development ala Piaget
Language acquisition
Christenson rhetoric

Assessment and Grading

Diagnosis of student problems
Remediation
Modes of responding to student work
Grading student writing
Holistic assessment
Developing self-evaluation skills in students

Special Student Needs

ESL
Learning disabled
Minorities
Motivational techniques
Self-esteem (student)

Other

How to do an inservice
Setting up a writing laboratory
Publishing
Parents working with children

SCHOOL YEAR INSERVICES

Number of Inservices offered:

Most of the national sites send trained teacher consultants to conduct inservices in their own or other schools. Projects beginning during the summer of 1979, of course, have not yet generated a pool of teacher consultants to conduct inservices during the school year. Those sites could not offer final information about inservice offerings, although most have made some plans for 1979-80. Of the 33 second and third year sites responding to the National Director's survey, 82% indicated that they were currently engaged in offering school year inservices. Second year sites varied in the number of inservices given during 1978-79, with 2 sites offering only 1 workshop during the year and 1 site offering as many as 45 different sessions. Third year sites varied less in the number of offerings made in 1978-79, with 1 site giving only 2 inservices during the year, while the most active site gave 25 inservices. Computer analysis of the data did not allow detection of the length of those inservice offerings, thus a site offering 45 one-session workshops could potentially be no "busier" than the site offering 4 or 5 ten-session, 30-hour inservices.

Table 11 summarizes that general demographic information of the various school year inservice offerings.

---

insert Table 11 about here

TABLE 11

	Number of "Standard"* Inservices in 1978 - 1979	Number of "Standard"* Inservices prior to 1978 - 1979
Average	2nd year $\bar{X}$ = 10.0 3rd year $\bar{X}$ = 10.0	3rd year $\bar{X}$ = 3
Range	2nd year 1 - 45 3rd year 2 - 25	3rd year 0 - 30

*30 hour inservices

Demographics of Inservice Offerings in 1978-79

Table 12 shows the range and average number of hours comprising the "standard" inservice offering of the sites. A so noted in that table is the number of teachers enrolled in inservice at second and third year sites. Wide variance is found among sites in the number of teachers attending inservice programs, although the total numbers of teachers served by a site each year seems unrelated to whether the site is in its second or third year.

---

insert Table 12 about here

Structure of School Year Inservices

Table 13 lists the various Inservice program lengths reported by the project directors. The most popular length Inservice offerings

---

Insert Table 13 about here

---

include those lasting only one session and those lasting from 6-9 sessions, although almost all sites indicated a willingness to fit the Inservice schedule to the particular needs of a district.

Like the Summer Invitational Program, many school-year Inservices involve participants in writing, editing, presenting, etc., as well as hearing presentations by a coordinator or imported teacher/consultant. As shown in Table 14, there is extremely wide variation among inservices.

---

insert Table 14 about here

TABLE 12

	Number of Hours in Inservice	Number of Teachers Served in Inservices
Average	$\bar{X}$ = 23	2nd year $\bar{X}$ = 254 3rd year $\bar{X}$ = 231
Range	2 - 75	2nd year 15 - 1000 3rd year 71 - 500

TABLE 13 SITES' INSERVICE OFFERINGS *

	1 Session	2-5 Sessions	6-9 Sessions	11+ Sessions
1st year sites (proposed)	95%	16%	90%	21%
2nd year sites	100%	14%	91%	36%
3rd year sites	100%	27%	100%	46%

* percentages indicate number of sites offering or proposing to offer such a format

TABLE 14 TYPES OF ACTIVITIES IN SCHOOL-YEAR INSERVICES

	Presentations by participants	Presentations by leaders	Presentations by "expert" guests	Writing by Participants	Other
Average	30%	30%	12%	26%	3%
Range	0 - 90%	0 - 80%	0 - 50%	0 - 60%	0 - 30%

National sites show great variation in the coordination and leadership of inservice activities. Some sites offer inservice which is as much as 80% led by a single coordinator, while others offer programs which are predominantly exchange sessions for participants (up to 90% participant presentations). These arrangements are departures from the standard BAWP Inservice model, which rarely, if ever, invites participants to make presentations. BAWP workshops are typically led by a variety of Summer Fellows in combination with coordinators and BAWP central staff members.

In addition to presentations on teaching methods, NWP inservices offer a variety of activities. Four directors reported including peer writing/response groups, another included watching videotapes of teachers in classrooms, and one mentioned time spent on evaluation of the presentations by participants.

SECTION II

RESULTS OF 17 NATIONAL WRITING PROJECT REPORTS REGARDING TEACHER ATTITUDE AND BEHAVIOR

INTRODUCTION

The following infomation is based on materials submitted by National Writing Project (NWP) directors which describe the evaluations conducted at various sites in 1978-79. Seventeen sites submitted materials by the deadline, which varied in quantity, quality, and emphasis. Fifteen of these evaluated teacher change resulting from the Summer Institute, while two reports (in 1979) evaluated teacher change as a result of school-year inservices.

Exact numbers of responses are derived from counts made of untabulated data received from directors and from directors' reports containing tabulated data of teachers' responses. Together these totalled 342 teacher evaluations. Some directors' reports, however, relied on quantitative summaries like, "a majority of teachers". These unspecified reports are not included in the numerical findings which follow. They are considered in the descriptions of general attitudes and trends.

Far more extensive evaluations have been completed on BAWP participants than those at any other site. Thus, data gathered at other NWP sites will be discussed in comparison with data on BAWP participants.

One final caution should be noted. In almost all cases, NWP data outlined here were submitted to the BAWP central office as part of sites' interim reports. Therefore, it is impossible to determine the completeness of the data, or to assess the context in which the data were collected.(See Appendices B and C for "Item Analysis of Participant Evaluation of NWP Program Offerings" and "Evaluations Submitted from NWP Sites".)

ATTITUDE TOWARD WORKSHOP EXPERIENCE

All evaluations from 1978 and 1979 NWP Summer Institutes reported very high overall ratings of the project. Many participants described the writing project as the best educational experience of their lives and praised it for helping them establish a new philosophy of teaching composition. BAWP Evaluation data gathered for the Long Term Follow-up Report replicated these responses. Almost all BAWP participants felt strongly enthusiastic about their experience with the project regardless of their grade level or years of involvement; this high level of enthusiasm did not diminish over the years. Many Fellows stated that they would recommend the writing project to their collegues.

Over 100 NWP participants from the 15 Summer Institutes in 1978 and 1979 commented enthusiastically on the quality of leadership by staff coordinators of the summer workshops, calling them "sensitive to participants' needs", "part of the group", "non-domineering", "open to others' philosophies", and expert at guiding discussion in fruitful directions. Very few NWP participants commented on the initial interview with project staff, although BAWP 1979 Summer Fellows rated the interview as a positive experience.

NWP participants frequently reported that they felt a sense of unity within the group, and credited the weekly after-workshop socials (which are part of the BAWP model) as a major means of generating this feeling.

Participants from both 1978 and 1979 NWP workshops reported that the project significantly improved their writing skills. Over 100 teachers stated that the writing project helped them become better writers by generating confidence in their writing ability and improving specific writing skills or strategies. Comments on teacher questionnaires

indicated that participants enjoyed having to write; they often developed new insight into their students' experience with the writing process after examining their own writing. These findings are consistent with responses from BAWP's 1979 Summer Fellows who rated the project's impact on their growth as writers with a mean rating of 3.5 on a scale of 0 - 4.

The primary experience which generated confidence in writing and improved writing ability was the writing/response group. During the Summer Institutes participants would meet in small groups twice a week (or more) to discuss one another's writing and receive peer feedback on samples of their own writing. They became aware of their weaknesses as writers, learned how to revise their work, and how to distinguish between constructive and unconstructive critical responses. They also improved their ability to articulate helpful criticism for other writers.

Over 125 NWP participants from both 1978 and 1979 reported strongly positive ratings of the writing/response groups, and several of these teachers stated that they planned to continue these groups after the close of the Summer Institute. The BAWP 1979 Summer Institute questionnaires also revealed consistently high rating of the writing/response groups. The mean rating for the groups was 3.7 (on a scale of 0 - 4). The majority of the respondents on the BAWP Long Term Follow-up questionnaire reported using the writing/response groups as a result of their BAWP experiences.

Only a few participants criticized these groups, but always for the purpose of strengthening and expanding them. Some NWP participants and BAWP 1979 Summer Fellows suggested that peer feedback was sometimes "too polite"; people occasionally were not honest enough when criticizing

peers. One site director reported that these small group discussions often "failed to rise above the level of picking over details of grammar and diction", but this complaint came from the only site which shifted response group membership every week. This was also the only site to call the writing groups the least popular activity. A few NWP Fellows stated that not enough time was spent in the writing response groups, reflecting the general enthusiasm for the groups expressed at most sites.

Open-ended comments from summer participant questionnaires regarding the overall organization of the workshops were few, suggesting satisfaction with the use of time. The most common criticisms of the program organization focused on the participants' presentations, their sequence, their length, the occasionally overlapping content, and the lack of advance notice to presentors. Several teachers from the 1978 institutes also expressed a strong desire to have a schedule for teacher presentations set early in the summer and adhered to. Typically, project directors tried to remain flexible in assigning dates for presentations, juggling a number of factors as they came to know more about the participants and the needs of the group.

NWP participants, along with BAWP 1979 Summer Institute participants and respondents to the Long Term Follow-up Questionnaire, consistently reported that they valued their peers' presentations on the teaching of writing, and learned many new techniques from them. They also responded favorably to the "teacher as experts" approach to teacher education.

The major complaint from most of the sites was the lack of adequate discussion of each participant's presentation. Summer Fellows felt the need to raise more questions and explore more ideas after each presentation, either in small groups or as a single group. Presentors themselves expressed a wish for more immediate feedback, not only on the content, but also on

their manner of presentation, in order to help prepare them for their roles as future teacher/consultants to the inservices.

Approximately 100 NWP participants from both 1978 and 1979 commented positively on the quality of guest speakers' presentations and the value of having them. Some, however, said there were too many guest speakers. BAWP 1979 Summer Fellows indicated mild enthusiasm, rating the guest speakers as the least valuable of all workshop components (a mean rating of 3.0 on a scale of 0 - 4). Several BAWP Fellows suggested that there be fewer guest speakers. A few commented that guest speakers should make presentations which related to inservices, since many participants would be coordinating inservices in the future or making presentations at inservices. Other Fellows desired more diversity among speakers.

IMPACT ON TEACHING ABILITY AND ON STUDENTS

NWP participants consistently reported that the writing project had an extremely positive impact on their growth as teachers of writing. Teachers made over 130 positive comments on their growth as teachers and confidence in their teaching ability resulting from their participation in the writing project workshops. More teachers made positive open-ended comments on this effect than on any other produced by the writing project. All of the BAWP 1979 Summer Institute participants report the same positive impact on their growth as teachers.

After several NWP participants returned to their classes in the fall following the Summer Institute, they reported that they enjoyed teaching more as a result of their experience in the writing project. Many teachers indicated that they expected their students to show improvement in their

writing ability or that they have actually seen writing improvement. Several participants stated that their students enjoyed writing more. This finding is consistent with responses of the majority of teachers surveyed in the Long Term Follow-up Report who claimed that improvements in their students' overall writing skill and enjoyment of writing had occurred as a result of their BAWP experience.

CHANGES IN TEACHING TECHNIQUES IN SCHOOLS

NWP participants made strongly positive statements regarding the applicability of techniques learned in the writing project workshops. Numerous participants stated that they planned to implement workshop techniques in their classes. BAWP 1979 Summer Institute questionnaires revealed similar ratings of usefulness of techniques. In the Long Term Follow-up Report, the majority of the respondents regularly used new techniques for teaching writing as a result of their BAWP experiences.

At one NWP site, all Teacher Consultants who had conducted school-year inservices were interviewed. These interviews revealed that school-year inservice participants were often encouraged to implement workshop techniques immediately in their classes and to bring students' written responses back to the inservices. The experience of applying theory to practice reportedly helped to build participants' confidence in the workshop techniques.

NWP participants from both 1978 and 1979 generally gave favorable ratings to the presentation on holistic writing assessment techniques. Some comments indicated, however, that not enough time and explanation were always given to this subject. NWP sites frequently include holistic assessment experiences in their institutes. We have not investigated the extent to which teachers find holistic assessment useful in their individual classrooms.

Use of holistic assessment by an individual participant generally requires that teacher to involve other teachers and/or administrators in his or her own school. Where a school or department is already looking for an assessment tool, the NWP teacher consultant is in a position to coordinate a holistic assessment.

NWP participants have only occasionally reported that they have discussed writing more in their schools as a result of their writing project experiences. This small return may be due to the fact that most of the evaluations submitted to the national sites were conducted directly after the close of the Summer Institute before teachers had returned to their schools. In contrast, over 75% of the respondents on the BAWP "Follow-up" questionnaire indicated that BAWP had an impact on increasing the frequency of their discussions about writing with fellow teachers.

FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES

Several NWP teachers expressed a desire to participate in some form of follow-up activity subsequent to their initial writing project training. They wanted to be kept abreast of new teaching techniques or the latest developments in research, and to discuss their successes and failures in implementing workshop techniques. Comments on the NWP Site Director's survey revealed that several participants have already initiated activities to follow and expand their writing project experience. One group of teachers created an "inter-service workshop", while other projects have started their own newsletters.

Former BAWP teachers included in the Long Term Follow-up Report and the 1979 BAWP Summer Institute Fellows have also expressed a desire to participate in subsequent writing project activities. The most frequent suggestion for improvement of future activities was to allow teachers to participate in a

follow-up reunion. They expressed a need to be able to discuss their successes and failures with workshop techniques and learn new approaches to teaching writing.

Several NWP and BAWP 1979 Summer Institute participants stated that they would like to continue the writing/response groups after the close of the workshop. Many, however, felt that they needed some guidance from project staff in coordinating the groups.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The most common criticism of the NWP summer workshops has been the lack of adequate discussion of participants' presentations. Apparently not enough time has been allocated for feedback on the presentations. Summer Fellows need to be prepared for their roles as teacher/consultants, and peer feedback on the presentations would enable them to revise their material for the future. If teachers could see the presentations as "constructive experiences and not one shot presentations", as one participant commented, they would perhaps, be more insightful in modifying their materials.

One participant pointed out a critical factor involving the discussion of presentations by suggesting that one of the staff should remind participants on the first day of the institute that a presentation by a teacher does not embody the total teaching philosophy of that person. Rather, each participant presents one method for teaching writing and participants should not be criticized if their one presentation doesn't provide a defense for a total approach to teaching writing. Position papers could be discussed near the close of the institute to allow participants the chance to give one another written or oral

feedback on their philosophies of teaching writing. One site director made the suggestion that workshop coordinators might enrich participants' presentations by:

-recommending relevent readings for each presentor's topic
-suggesting opposing or alternative points of view from those presented
-expanding on ideas presented
-presenting relevant research findings.

The staff could lead the discussion of the presentations in a constructive direction by presenting relevant additional information and by eliciting discussion of how the presentor might modify his or her material.

The Missouri Writing Project provided a unique evaluation of presentations. After each teacher's presentation, participants filled out a response sheet. These response sheets were given to the presentor who was asked to summarize the responses and then in written form, describe the ways in which the presentation would be changed before it was given at an inservice program. This evaluation took very little time and gave participants valuable suggestions on how to revise their presentations for their future roles as teacher/consultants. Use of response sheets, however, did not allow for group discussion which can lead to elaboration of topics and stimulation to new insights.

The Montana Writing Project included a post-presentation discussion devoted to teaching ideas demonstrated. Teachers discussed ways to adapt and expand the technique for the classroom and for consulting. The project report stated that the discussion of presentations often "was the most propitious time for the exchange of ideas, techniques, and problems the teachers found prevalent in their classrooms".

The Montana Writing Project also asked teachers to write out their presentations, describing procedures and materials, amount of time for each step, and possible problems teachers might encounter. In the process of writing, teachers reportedly were able to amend or improve upon their presentations. The written versions were compiled into a sourcebook for teachers to use in their own schools and districts.

Besides asking for more discussion of presentations, teachers have suggested adhering to a more rigid schedule of presentations. Some participants wanted more advance notice of the date of their own presentations. Others observed that "more careful" scheduling might result in better juxtaposition of presentations. Some felt that presentations should be held to the allowed time to guarantee time for questions and discussion of ideas.

Participants suggested other changes in the Institutes. One frequent request has been to demonstrate project techniques in a classroom setting. Many teachers believe they need to see precisely how various techniques are implemented so they will have a more concrete conception of how they should use the techniques with their own students. Another way to ensure the proper use of the techniques would be to invite teacher/consultants to visit participants' classes and monitor the writing instruction, giving feedback to teachers on their successes and failures with project techniques and providing suggestions for improvement. (See Critical Competitors Report for a discussion of the uses of monitoring of program implementation.)

Many Summer Fellows have also suggested spending more time on developing strategies to change schools' writing programs. One site reported that

the writing project had a greater impact on writing programs in small schools where teachers had greater opportunity to share plans. At other sites teachers have noted the difficulty of bringing about changes in large schools and departments, and have asked project directors to devote time to discussing how administrators might be converted to support innovative teaching in the classroom.

The most popular activity among the sites, the writing/response groups, also elicited some suggestions for improvement. These included the sharing of written work among small groups, and the chance to respond with written criticism to the work of other groups. Some participants also suggested recombining groups at some point in the summer to provide a greater variety of responses for every writer.

One site director, however, who reported that the groups were reconstituted every week, claimed that "the critical discussions of papers in the editing groups were less successful than any other activity." Participants reportedly criticized errors in grammar and diction, and the directors, who sat in on the groups, were unable to guide group discussion in a constructive direction. The director reported that a general "hostility" among participants seemed to be generated in these editing sessions. It is possible that the frequent shifts in group membership prevented teachers from finding the rapport that usually develops in the writing/response groups which maintain the same members throughout the summer.

Some Summer Fellows suggested that there be more communication between the groups and directors to clarify objectives of the groups and help keep the discussion constructive. However, a few project directors protested that they did not want to play the role of "authority" within the groups.

One site used the "fishbowl" technique, where a particularly effective group carried on their response session in front of the rest of the teachers, ultimately involving everyone in a higher-level response to the papers being read. Some teachers believed that this demonstration was helpful in redirecting the emphasis of their own groups.

Even though NWP participants have consistently reported strongly positive overall ratings for the workshops, it is clear that many have ideas about how their particular experiences might have been improved. Because these suggestions vary so much from one site to the next it is impossible to suggest changes that should be made at all NWP sites.

SECTION III

STUDENT ASSESSMENT

INTRODUCTION

In response to direct inquiry from our Evaluation Unit, ten NWP sites submitted information about student writing assessments which they had conducted. In addition, this Evaluation Unit, in cooperation with BAWP, had already completed both a large-scale writing assessment as well as three small, classroom-based research studies which included writing assessment data. The assessments by BAWP and the ten other NWP sites are described in the summaries that follow. In every case, they are based upon the information provided, either in written reports or in telephone interviews. (In some cases the data are incomplete as reported. Additional questions should be addressed to the contact person listed for each study.)

A standard format has been used throughout to allow comparisons wherever appropriate. Some general observations may be made about the studies:

(1) Purposes of the studies: Most of the assessments were done as a part of general program evaluation. Only two NWP sites (Texas Hill Country and BAWP) examined the effectiveness of specific techniques for teaching writing. Only one site (BAWP) devoted a study to basic writing processes.

The emphasis on program evaluation reflects the strong accountability pressures that the NWP sites face. That only 10 of the 36 second and third year sites were involved in this sort of activity makes clear the difficulty of such work, resulting both from limited or non-existent

funding and also from the general lack of knowledge about how to design and conduct evaluation studies. Those described here provide some useful models and should be shared among all the NWP sites. There is obviously need for increased evaluation activity by a greater number of sites.

In addition, the identification of a "core curriculum" for the NWP Summer Institutes (page 19, this report) should stimulate more methods studies aimed at evaluating specific teaching strategies. If the core techniques can be found to improve student writing skills, NWP sites will have a stronger answer to the question of whether teacher training actually helps improve student performance. These classroom methods can be examined individually (as done by BAWP and Texas Hill Country) or more generally, as part of a total approach to writing instruction (as done by Rutgers, with Janet Emig's approach). Although the NWP experience for teachers cannot be reduced to learning a few specific classroom techniques, NWP sites are in a stronger position where they can establish that the techniques they emphasize are among the most effective available.

(2) Identifying student comparison groups: Several of the studies described here are weakened because of their procedures for choosing comparison groups. Although the term control groups is used throughout the descriptions, in almost no case were students or teachers randomly assigned to groups from a single population. Some examples are given, however, of appropriate measures of comparison and project groups. In these cases pre-instruction measures were incorporated statistically into the comparison of post-test performances of project and control classes. Five different statistical procedures were used: method of

adjusted averages, analysis of covariance, analysis of variance, t-tests on gain scores, and multivariate analysis. For these studies, then, there is some assurance that differences in performance on the post-tests reflected differences in treatment, rather than differences in the initial abilities of the students.

(3) Identifying comparison teachers: Another major problem for general program evaluation is the identification of comparison teachers. Because many of the NWP techniques are used by other English teachers, it is difficult to make comparisons between outcomes for students unless some inventories of classroom practices are taken. Attitude scales (e.g. the Emig-King Attitudes toward Teaching Writing) can also be used to identify differences between project and comparison teachers and register the effects of NWP training on teachers. Only two sites (Rutgers and BAWP) used such measures. (For a list of other problems concerning choice of comparison teachers, see p. 43 "Limits of Interpretation".)

(4) Procedures for assessment: Although writing topics and procedures used to conduct assessments varied among the sites, ten used the same assessment technique---holistic marking of student essays. Only two of those sites (BAWP and Oregon) employed analytic measures of student writing in addition to holistic assessment. (A third, Inland Writing Project, is presently collecting analytic counts on a sample of their essays in an effort to characterize key differences in student writing, grades 4-12.) Another site (Rutgers) used student attitude surveys to supplement their holistic assessment of student writing. Two other sites (Redwood and Texas Hill Country) used analytic measures exclusively.

Limitations of time and money were cited frequently as reasons for not doing more comprehensive analysis of student writing. In addition, there may be a lack of awareness of appropriate measures for conducting analytic readings. All of the five sites doing analytic readings developed their own procedures and criteria or adapted existing ones. Because of increasing reservations by some experts in the field (e.g. see Keech, NWP Newsletter, March, 1979) about the sensitivity of holistic assessment for registering statistically significant differences between groups, it may be necessary to accompany holistic assessment with other measures of student performance if program effects are to be fully understood.

(5) Topics: Another question for evaluators concerns use of similar but not identical topics for writing at pre and post-testing. If students should respond differently to the two topics, results of the assessment would be distorted. On the other hand, arguments can be made against using the same topic pre and post. Students may be bored writing about the same topic a second time, or their performance may artificially rise due to the "practice effect" (being measured on the same task twice).

Finally most assessments reported here collect only one sample of student writing in response to a somewhat limited task. A single essay may not be a fair indication of the range of student skill, especially in modes of discourse not being tested. Further, since students are known to perform unevenly on different writing occasions, one writing sample is not a reliable indicator of student ability.

These problems can be minimized or avoided if two topics, in different modes, are given both pre and post. In addition, topics can be scrambled

and randomly assigned so that all topics will be used by at least some students both pre and post. (See BAWP small classroom studies, and Oregon Writing Project for examples.)

(6) Limits of interpretation: With every description we have attempted to describe outcomes as well as to suggest their limitations, based on the general methodological concerns described above.

SITE: Anchorage Writing Project, Anchorage School District, Anchorage, Alaska 99504

CONTACT PERSON: Richard Krieger

TITLE OF STUDY: Student Writing Assessment

DATES OF STUDY: Fall 1978 - Spring 1979

PURPOSES OF STUDY: Program Evaluation

DESIGN OF THE STUDY:

Research Question: Would students of project teachers score higher than students of non-project teachers on holistically-scored essays?

Project:	Students of project teachers		(# of teachers)
Number:	elementary level:	232	11
	junior high level:	53	2
Control:	Students of teachers not associated with the project		
Number:	elementary level:	250	12
	junior high level:	53	2

** The number of students is approximate, based on equal class distributions for project and non-project teachers.

Measures: On the post-test only, essays were scored holistically. Teacher Attitude Questionnaire (developed by Anchorage Writing Project) was also administered.

Writing Assessments Conducted:

HOLISTIC MEASURES

Topic: (administered at year end with no pre-test) "Talking to Adults" Teacher discretion advised "on what to emphasize to your students depending on their grade level and your normal routine for presenting a writing topic".

Scoring: A 6 point scale was used. Each paper was read three times, thereby providing for a scoring range of 3 - 18.

Readers: Three teachers for grades 2-6 and three teachers for grades 7-8. Teachers had all attended an Anchorage Writing Project Summer Invitational.

DATA ANALYSIS: The t-test statistic was used to test for statistically significant differences between control and project groups at each grade level.

OUTCOMES: In grades 5,6,7,8, project group means were higher than control group means (statistically significant). In grades 2,3, and 4 there was no statistically significant difference between control and project groups.

Anchorage Writing Project (continued):

A teacher attitude questionnaire was also administered at year-end to all project teachers. In all cases, a majority of those teachers agreed that the project had increased:

- student response to writing
- student productivity
- student proficiency as a writer
- student enjoyment of writing
- positive class climate
- teacher to student contact
- teacher enjoyment of teaching

LIMITS OF INTERPRETATION: In the absence of pre-treatment measures of student ability, it is not possible to interpret the reported differences in post-treatment performance by the two groups.

SITE: Area III Writing Project, English Dept., UC Davis, Davis, CA 95616

CONTACT PERSON: Wayne Harsh, Director

TITLE OF STUDY: Area III Writing Project

DATES OF THE STUDY: Fall 1977 - Spring 1978

PURPOSES OF THE STUDY: Program evaluation and Title IVC evaluation

DESIGN OF THE STUDY:

Research Question: Would students of project teachers improve more from pre to post than those of non-project teachers on holistically scored writing samples?

Project: Students of Area III Summer Fellows (from 1977 Summer Institute)

Number:

elementary level:	Pre = 81	Post = 68
junior high:	Pre = 70	Post = 50
senior high:	Pre = 371	Post = 361

Control: Students of colleagues of Area III Summer Fellows (colleagues were from same school as fellows and chosen by Fellows)

Number:

elementary level:	Pre = 76	Post = 70
junior high:	Pre = 70	Post = 50
senior high	Pre = 374	Post = 367

** Although an effort was made to test the same students pre/post, it was not possible in all cases.

Measures: Pre and post essays were collected. Both pre and post used the same topic.

Writing Assessments Conducted:

HOLISTIC MEASURES

Topic: Describe an object (not a person, animal or event) you are especially attached to and tell why you feel strongly about it, the way it came into your life, or the way it has taken on meaning through time.

Scoring: Raters used a 4 point scale (2,4,6,8) with the possibility of a +1 or -1 on any one score. Total scores were distributed on an eighteen point scale, based on the sum of two independent readings (1-9). A training session was held on a Friday evening, with the reading conducted during the next day (Saturday).

Readers: Sixteen teachers from local schools, elementary through senior high levels, plus one college instructor; twelve had participated in holistic scoring previously.

DATA ANALYSIS: A three-way analysis of variance was performed using a fixed model so that generalizations could be made only to the three grade levels.

Area III Writing Project, UC Davis (continued):

OUTCOMES: Significant differences were found among the three grade levels. None were found between experimental and control groups and between pre and post-testing (within grade levels or combined over-all).

LIMITS OF INTERPRETATION: Students were not randomly assigned to sections, and classes were not matched for general ability level or course content. There were disproportionate sample sizes between project and control at the elementary and junior high levels. In addition, the group means compared pre to post-test did not represent pre-post performance of the same students in all cases, since some classes changed members during the year, and unmatched pre or post essays were not dropped from the sample. Finally, variability of student performance on holistically-scored writing samples, together with the effects of regression to the mean, tends to wash out all but the grossest differences between groups, especially where only one sample of writing is collected at pre and post-testing. Any of these factors could have caused a finding of "no differences" when some real ones might have existed between project and control groups.

SITE: Bay Area Writing Project, UC Berkeley

CONTACT PERSON: Miles Myers and Cathy Keech

TITLE OF STUDY: Showing, Not Telling, by Rebekah Caplan and Catharine Keech

DATES OF THE STUDY: October, 1978 to January, 1979

PURPOSES OF THE STUDY: Classroom-based research and program evaluation

DESIGN OF THE STUDY: A specific method (developed by Rebekah Caplan) for teaching students the use of more specific, vivid language was tried by three teachers.

Research Questions:

1) Do project students improve more in their performance on post-test measures than do control students?

2) Do project students increase their use of concrete writing more than control students, comparing pre-post essays?

3) Is the use of concrete details positively associated with scores on the holistic measure?

4) Are there any describable patterns in the use of concrete and abstract language at different levels in the holistic scoring range?

Student Population: Three teachers of 12th grade advanced composition classes at three different schools participated. Each teacher taught one project class and one control class. Students were assigned to project or control sections by the school's computerized class assignment procedures from a general population of students eligible for this course. Designation of one class as project and one as control was arbitrary.

Project: 73 students in three composition classes being taught the Caplan method along with their usual writing curriculum

Control: 56 students of the same teachers receiving the same writing instruction as the project classes except they did not use the Caplan materials

Measures: Two modes of writing were tested: argument and personal narrative. Within each mode, two similar topics were developed, then randomly assigned to pre or post-test, for students. Students were allowed to write for 30 minutes on each topic.

Writing Assessment Conducted:

HOLISTIC MEASURES

Topics: Argumentative

1) Television is a bad influence. Agree or disagree. Give examples.

2) It is better to be a woman than a man. Agree or disagree. Give examples.

Bay Area Writing Project (continued):

Personal Narrative
3) Describe something which you enjoyed doing as a child.

4) Describe something from which you learned a lesson.

Scoring: Anchor papers were used to train readers to use a 1-5 point scale. All papers were read twice resulting in a 2-10 point range. All the essays were read in a single day. (A second day was required to complete the analytic reading.)

Readers: Five English teachers experienced in holistic assessment.

ANALYTIC MEASURES

Using a special procedure developed by Keech, papers were read and every sentence assigned to one of four levels of abstraction.

Other Measures: Additional data gathered on students included CTBS scores (California Test of Basic Skills), an objective language skills test developed by Paul Diederich, and the number of assignments completed in the program

DATA ANALYSIS: 1) Groups were compared on all measures, pre, post, and on difference scores, using t-test.

2) Correlations examined between performance on holistic scale and degree of concreteness, as measured by two analytic counts: the ratio of most concrete (level 4) sentences to total sentences, and the mean range of movement across abstraction levels ($r=.37$ sig. at .05).

OUTCOMES: 1) The one project class which used all parts of the training program showed large statistically significant gains in holistic scores on both the argument and personal narrative essay. The same teacher's control class did not show statistically significant improvement from pre to post-test.

2) The project class showing holistic gains also made dramatic increases in use of level 4 (most concrete) sentences, going from 5% on pre-test to 15% on post-test. This group also was the only group showing a gain in the mean number of abstraction levels used by individual students.

3) There were no significant differences from pre to post for project classes of the other two teachers both of whom used the program to a much lesser degree. For one of the teachers, there were also identifiable motivational factors which might account for the decline of post-test scores of all of her students.

4) Greater use of concrete details was associated with better holistic scores.

SITE: Bay Area Writing Project, UC Berkeley

CONTACT PERSON: Miles Myers and Cathy Keech

TITLE OF THE STUDY: The Write Occasion by Patrick Woodworth and Catharine Keech

DATES OF THE STUDY: October 1978

PURPOSES OF THE STUDY: Classroom-based research on factors affecting performance

DESIGN OF THE STUDY:

Research Question: Is writing better when students are writing for specific rather than general audiences, and may these audiences be imaginary as well as real to provide the necessary context for purposeful writing?

Student Population: A total of 92 ninth through twelfth grade students in six classes taught by the same teacher were randomly assigned one of three different writing topics.

Measures: Students wrote 30 minute essays on one of three versions of a personal narrative task.

Writing Assessment Conducted:

HOLISTIC MEASURES

Topics: (used for all three topics) Write about the "first time you experienced something which may later have become ordinary, or may never have been repeated, but was special when experienced for the first time.

1) (no audience specified) 'Describe...'

2) (imaginary audience specified) "Imagine you are writing for someone who has not yet had, but may soon have, a similar experience..."

3) (real audience specified) "Choose someone you know who..." (same qualifications as in Topic #2)

Scoring: A scoring guide was developed using sample papers from all three different prompt conditions. The reading was completed in a single day. Papers from all three audience conditions were pooled for scoring to a single rubric.

Readers: English teachers with experience in holistic scoring read the papers. (Four readers including Woodworth and Keech)

ANALYTIC MEASURES

Papers were re-analyzed for specific signs of audience awareness, genre choice (journal, letter, informal essay, short story, etc.) and openings and closings.

DATA ANALYSIS: Using the method of adjusted averages, with teacher estimate of student ability as input variable, mean differences in holistic scores for the three topics were tested for statistical significance.

OUTCOMES: There were no differences between mean holistic scores for the three conditions. Other analyses, together with this lack of finding, suggest the genre called "short story", distinguished from "informal essay" by signs of literary intent like imaginative openings and endings, use of imagery or other stylistic devices, appeared in all three conditions, although more frequently in conditions 1 and 2, and almost always earned top scores. This genre indicates sophisticated audience awareness, but the awareness is of a general reader, not a particular one.

CONCLUSIONS: Students may regard test readers as being like the "general audience" addressed by most literature and much non-fiction writing. Therefore, when the writing task invites writing like that done for a general audience, the specification of a particular audience does not provide a basis for improving writing on this task.
In designing a writing prompt, topics which allow wide variation in invention, inspire the writers to write with intention from their own experience and convictions. This factor is more important than the provision of an imaginary rhetorical context.

SITE: Bay Area Writing Project

CONTACT PERSON: Miles Myers and Cathy Keech

TITLE OF STUDY: Writing From Given Information by Stephanie Gray and Catharine Keech

DATES OF THE STUDY: October 1978 to May 1979

PURPOSES OF THE STUDY: Classroom-based research and program evaluation

DESIGN OF THE STUDY: The study tested the effects on ninth and eleventh grade students of a training program developed by Stephanie Gray, "Writing From Given Information", which was designed to give students practice in organizing and presenting information in writing. One ninth grade teacher and one eleventh grade teacher taught two matched classes at grade level. Students in each grade had been, in effect, randomly assigned to one of two classes from the general population of ninth or eleventh grade students. Teachers arbitrarily chose one section to be the control class, one to be the project class at each grade level.

Research Questions: 1) Would students in the project classes improve their holistic scores more than those in the control classes from pre to post?

2) Would students in the project classes increase their use of the specific measures taught by the training program more than control students (e.g. adverbial clauses, comparing words and phrases, and method development)?

3) Is there any difference in ninth grade and eleventh grade response to the materials?

Student Population:

Project: 17 ninth grade students and 25 eleventh grade students in two classes using the Gray training program along with their usual composition training.

Control: 20 ninth grade students and 28 eleventh grade students in two classes exactly the same as the project classes except for the exclusion of the Gray training program from their instruction.

Measures: Two essays (one comparison and contrast, the other descriptive) were collected both pre and post from all students. Topics were scrambled and randomly assigned to students.

Writing Assessment Conducted:

HOLISTIC MEASURES

Topics: Compare and contrast
1) Compare two stores you know which sell similar items. Consider such things as prices, service... Which of the two stores do you prefer? Explain why.

Bay Area Writing Project (continued):

2) Compare two annual holidays or special events you celebrate in your family (such as Thanksgiving, Passover, etc.). Consider such things as food, decorations, etc. Which of the two do you prefer? Explain why.

Process Essay

3) Imagine that someone named Lee Jacobs, who looks exactly like you, has agreed to take your place at school for a day. Write a letter describing in complete detail how to get through one part of the day.

4) Imagine you are going to be away for the summer and someone named Pat Michaels plans to live with your family and take over your duties at home. Write a letter describing in complete detail how to get through part of the day.

Scoring: The counts of syntactic features were based on unit lessons in Gray's training program. The rating of organization type was developed from a study of the kinds of essays produced by students in response to the compare topic.
Holistic and some analytic scoring were completed on the same day; additional analytic reading was done on a separate occasion.

Readers: Readers from the holistic scoring were re-trained for analytic scoring, and additional readers were used, including Stephanie Gray and Catharine Keech. Reliability checks were made by the latter.

ANALYTIC MEASURES

Frequency counts of certain features: number of adverbial clauses in the "process paper" essay, number of comparing words and phrases, and number of sentences combining both parts of the comparison in the compare essay. Finally, a rating of method of development or organization of the compare essay was made, using a four-point scale, with four as the most difficult and sophisticated method of drawing an extended comparison.

Other Measures: Objective data was gathered on each student (consisting of scores on California Test of Basic Skills). Teachers kept a journal of their teaching activities; each teacher covered the same chapters in the Gray materials.

DATA ANALYSIS: 1) Groups were compared on all measures (using pre, post, and difference scores) with t-tests performed to determine statistical significance.

2) Correlations were examined between performance on the holistic scale and on analytic measures.

OUTCOMES:

1) The eleventh grade project class made statistically significant gains on the holistic scores (pre-post) of both types of essays. They also increased the number of comparing terms they used and the number of integrating sentences (i.e. sentences which refer to both items being compared). Finally, over five times as many students chose the most difficult type of organization on the post-test as had on the pre-test.

2) The eleventh grade control class made a significant improvement in mean holistic score on the compare essay only. The gain was less than for the project class. The control students slightly increased their use of integrated comparing sentences, but did not increase use of comparing terms. There was no change in the proportion of control students using type 4, the most difficult method of organization.

3) Both project and control ninth grade classes declined in their holistic scores from pre to post. This pattern was attributed to lowered morale caused by the presence of a substitute in class for an extended period of time. Both classes showed striking increases in their use of integrating sentences from pre to post, with this increase greater for project than control students.

4) The project class declined in its rating of method of development from pre to post. It was tentatively hypothesized that the training program introduced ninth grade students to a method of comparing for which they lacked some necessary supporting skills, causing them to revert to the simplest level 1 type of development and only in rare cases (8%) to move to the most complex, level 4 development.

SITE: Bay Area Writing Project

CONTACT PERSON: Susan Thomas, Univeristy of California, Berkeley

TITLE OF THE STUDY: Student Writing Assessment, One Component of the Evaluation of the Bay Area Writing Project

DATES OF THE STUDY: Begun Spring, 1977; two years of testing; final reading, Spring, 1978.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY: Program Evaluation funded by Carnegie Foundation

DESIGN OF THE STUDY:

Research Questions:

Effects of Treatment I:
Will students of teachers trained in the BAWP Summer Invitational program, 1977, perform better at the end of an instructional year (1978) than the same teacher students performed at the end of the year prior to summer training (1977)?

Will control teachers show similar or different changes in the effectiveness of their teaching from one year to the next, as measured by differences in student performance in the two years?

Effects of Treatment II:
Will students of teachers trained in BAWP inservice programs during the instructional year (1977-78) perform better than students of the same teachers previous year?

Student Population:

Treatment I: Students from grades 10-12, taught by 12 BAWP 1977 Summer Fellows, at twelve different schools. Two different classes were tested for each teacher.

Control I: Students from grades 10-12 taught by 22 teachers, chosen to be equal in quality to the potential Summer Fellows.

Treatment II: Students from grades 10-12, taught by 11 teachers who were participating in three school inservices during the instructional year, 1977-78. Two classes were tested for most teachers.

Control II: No comparable teachers were tested. (Qualification: Some inservice teachers' and a few Summer Fellows' students were tested in Fall 1977, giving pre-post measures on the same students for these teachers. No control group was tested in this way.)

Measures: Two 20 minute essays, one in each of two modes of writing, were collected at the end of the first instructional year (1977) from students in most classes. New students of the same teachers wrote essays on the same topics at the end of the second instructional year (1978). The essays were holistically scored in a pooled reading.

Bay Area Writing Project (continued):

Writing Assessments Conducted:

Topics:

1) There are probably several places you would like to be right now rather than sitting in this room writing an essay. Choose ONE of these places and describe it vividly, so that your reader can understand why you would like to be there. You may include descriptions of your personal feelings in this situation. The place may be real or imaginary.

2) Explain what is wrong with the following argument:

"It's pretty clear that on the whole, women are superior to men. In the physical dimension, the best evidence for this is simply that women live longer, and by a substantial number of years. Other evidence is that women are virtually immune to several diseases that are fatal for many men; and on the mental side, there is the simple fact that girls, on the average, do better at school than boys."

Scoring:

Raters used a 1-6 point scale, giving each essay two readings, for a total range possible of 2-12 points. Essays in the two modes were scored by different readers, trained to different scoring guides which were developed to be used with anchor papers from the sample.

Readers:

Forty readers were all experienced in holistic scoring either from Educational Testing Service or BAWP experience, except for a group of college readers trained to read for the Subject A exam at Berkeley. Interrater reliability was .78 for one essay, .79 for the other.

DATA ANALYSIS:

Analysis of variance with t-tests of statistical significance was used in comparing treatment and control groups, pre and post-training (of teachers). Comparability of groups tested in 1977 and comparability of groups tested in 1978 was calculated, and groups were compared for differences in the amount student performance changed from 1977 to 1978.

OUTCOMES:

1) Across all groups and test periods, students achieved higher scores on the personal topic essay than on the critical mode essay.

2) Twelfth grade students of BAWP Invitational teachers scored higher than twelfth grade students of control teachers on both the pre-test and the post-test.

3) There was no statistically significant difference in writing performance between eleventh grade students in the control group on the pre-test. On the post-test, control group students scored higher on the combined total score.

Bay Area Writing Project (continued):

4) Tenth grade students of Invitational teachers were behind tenth grade students of control teachers on the pre-test. By post-testing, there was no difference in tenth grade writing performance (but this appears to be a result of a decrease in control group scores on the post-test).

5) For the most part, students of Invitational teachers scored slightly higher than students of Inservice teachers at both testing periods.

6) In conclusion, there were no consistent observable differences in pre-test or post-test performance between students of the Invitational teachers or students in the control group on these particular essays.

LIMITS OF INTERPRETATION: The fact that no consistent pattern of superior performance by students of BAWP trained teachers emerges from the data does not mean that the BAWP program has made little or no impact on students and teachers. Several factors limit interpretation of the data and offer alternative explanations for the findings:

1) Without data on individual students' prior abilities we cannot be absolutely certain that changes in the composition of the groups from pre to post-testing was not, in fact, responsible for the results.

2) In the absence of a suitable comparison group for Inservice teachers, we cannot know whether their students gained significantly from the program. Since typically they were not identified as "superior" teachers, they may have had more "room to grow" (finding five above may limit this possibility).

3) Inservice teachers were receiving training during, not prior to the school year 1977-78. In one district training was not completed until shortly before the post-test, limiting teachers' opportunity to put new training ideas into effect.

4)Despite the fact that the ceiling of the test was not reached, the Summer Invitational teachers may have already been achieving close to maximum results in their teaching at the time of the pre-test, and thus be unable to generate further gains from their students on the post-test.

5) It is not clear to what extent control teachers were using practices actually different from those used by Summer Invitational teachers. Since BAWP does not advocate a single model for teaching composition, but rather identifies and disseminates

a variety of practices, many of these techniques and approaches were applied by BAWP and non-BAWP teachers alike. Thus, we might not expect major differences in student writing performance between the two groups. Compared to less distinguished teachers, BAWP might have shown up more strongly.

6) The writing assessment measured only short term effects. Some BAWP teachers have reported experiencing a delayed reaction in which they see their first year of teaching after attending the BAWP program as one of sorting out, questioning, or consolidating ideas. Only later do they express a new sense of direction and greater willingness to revise their programs

7) Although it was the only logistically feasible alternative, the nature of the global scoring procedure limits the sensitivity of the essay test to variations in teaching practices, in terms of their effects on components of the composition-skills package.

8) The length of writing time allowed to complete each essay (20 minutes) makes this a test of impromptu writing, a common task in school. It does not permit an adequate evaluation of the effectiveness of BAWP in drafting techniques, editing procedures, or other skills in producing finished products.

9) As administered, the test provided no incentive for students' best performance: they knew it would not count toward their grade, nor would they immediately receive the results. This situation might have worked against BAWP students who may have used the time to pre-write rather than produce a finished piece.

SITE: Colorado Writing Project

CONTACT PERSON: Miles Olson, Director, CWP, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO

TITLE OF STUDY: A Report on Action Research

DATES OF THE STUDY: September 1977 - May 1978

PURPOSES OF THE STUDY: Program evaluation

DESIGN OF THE STUDY:

Student Population:

Project: Students of teachers from a Denver junior high school who participated in a CWP school-year inservice

Pre-test and Post-test: 67 students from 7th, 8th, and 9th grades, for a total N = 201*

Control: Students from a Denver junior high school judged to be similar to the inservice school in enrollment and characteristics of students and teachers.

Pre-test and Post-test: 67 students from 7th, 8th, and 9th grades, for a total N = 201*

* All students in both schools wrote pre-post essays; the sample group was randomly chosen from students at each grade level in the two schools.

Writing Assessment Conducted:

HOLISTIC MEASURES

Topics: (same pre - post) "Write about an object you are especially attached to, something which has deep personal meaning to you, something which has become a part of your life. You may want to consider the way it has taken on meaning through time."

Scoring: A 7 point scale was used with each paper being read twice for a total possible score of 2 - 14. "Prototype" or anchor papers were read to establish the scoring guide. Separate readings of papers at each grade level were conducted.

Readers: No identification of readers is made

DATA ANALYSIS: An analysis of covariance procedure was used to assess the level of difference between the samples, using the pretest as a covariate.

OUTCOMES: There was a significant difference found in the average post-test scores of the two groups, with the project students scoring significantly higher.

LIMITS OF INTERPRETATION: This is a strong study, especially given equal sample sizes from each grade level in both schools. Initial comparability of students in the two groups was not reported. Statistical adjustment of differences using pre-test measures is appropriate only if groups were not widely different in ability at the outset. Since only large differences appear to affect holistic means, the results of this study are impressive.

SITE: Inland Writing Project, San Bernardino/Riverside, California

CONTACT PERSON: Dan Donlan, School of Education, UC Riverside

TITLE OF STUDY: Title IVC Evaluation Narrative

DATES OF STUDY: October 1978 - May 1979

PURPOSES OF THE STUDY: Title IVC Program Evaluation

DESIGN OF THE STUDY:

Research questions: 1) Will students of teachers participating in the Project show significantly higher achievement than students of comparable teachers not involved in the Project?

2) Will students of teachers with fewer years of experience attain higher achievement than students of teachers with mor years of experience?

3) Will students of project teachers participating in the directed instruction group experience higher achievement than students of project teachers participating in the open instruction group?

Student population:

Project: Students of 16 Inland Writing Project teachers (7 of those teachers had experienced direct instruction training (traditional lecture-type) and 9 had experienced open instru tion training at 2 separate summer institutes).

Number: grades 4 - 12

direct instruction	pre = 209	post = 80
open instruction	pre = 305	post = 212

Control: students of 11 Riverside, CA teachers

Number: grades 4 - 12 pre = 295 post = 189

** teachers were matched on years of experience and grade levels taught for project and control groups. No effort was made to match student populations, but teachers were asked to select their most "average" class for inclusion in the study.

** for testing of research question #2, the 27 teachers were grouped irrespective of their involvement with the writing project. Thirteen teachers were classified as less experienced, and 14 as more experien

Measures: Same topic pre and post.

Writing Assessments Conducted:

Topic: Imagine you have gone to visit a friend in Santa Barbara. Somehow your baggage was lost en route as it did not appear under the bus when you got off at the station. Write a letter to the Lost & Found department of the bus station. Describe your suitcase and its contents -- be sure to mentio how you think the baggage may have been lost.

Scoring: A 1 through 4 point scale was used with each paper being read twice. Writing was not assessed on proper letter form. A random sampling of every 25th paper was collected for the development of a standard rubric on the 1 - 4 scale. A specific rubric was set for each point on the scale for the given topic and general characteristics for each rating were discussed. The rubric was pilot-tested on another set of papers.

Readers: Not available

DATA ANALYSIS: One-tailed t-tests will be performed on the data for each research question.

OUTCOMES:

Research Question #1: Students of teachers who participated in the project show greater mean score gains than students of teachers not participating in the project.

Research Question #2: Students of teachers with more experience show greater mean score increases than students of teachers with less experience.

Research Question #3: Students of teachers using direct instruction methods show greater mean score gains than students of teachers using open instruction.

LIMITS OF INTERPRETATION: Many limits exist in these data being interpreted with only the current analysis available.* In addition to being limited by mean score gains only, interpretation of further analysis should be cautioned by the following:

1) The group size of open instruction students is approximately three times that of direct instruction students (this invalidates the use of the t-test).

2) Students from groups have not been matched on any dimension of ability, thus significant pre-test differences may have existed.

3) Many teachers lost students at semester break. So also gained new students who were included in the fin post-testing. These deletions and additions may skew the data considerably as no data exists to determine incoming students' prior writing level, or type of teaching orientation previously experienced.

4) Groups were not matched by grade level: both groups contained 4th - 12th graders, possibly in disproportionate numbers. (This possibility is being subsequently checked.)

* Data are currently being reanalyzed to correct for limitations 1) and 4). In addition an analytic reading of a sample of essays is currently under way to identify characteristics of writing ability, grades 4 - 12.

SITE: New Jersey Writing Project, Rutgers University

CONTACT PERSON: Joyce Carroll, Dept. of Eng., McMurry College, Abilene, Tex. 79

TITLE OF STUDY: Process into Product: Awareness of the Composing Process Affects the Written Product

DATES OF THE STUDY: October 1977 to May 1978

PURPOSES OF THE STUDY: Program evaluation, doctoral dissertation

DESIGN OF THE STUDY:

Research Questions: 1) Do students of project-trained teachers improve more from pre to post-testing than comparable students of non-project teachers?

2) Will project-trained teachers show more favorable attitudes toward teaching writing from pre to post than non-project teachers?

3) Will students of project teachers demonstrate greater growth than students of non-project teachers on attitudes toward writing?

Student Population: 15 students were randomly selected from each of the eight project and seven control districts yielding a sample of 225 students from a total population of 1600 students.

Project: Students of 14 teachers from NJWP's 1977 Summer Institute

Control: Students from districts matched by New Jersey's District Factor grouping which includes educational background, occupational level, per capita income, percent poverty level, unemployment rate, population density, degree of urbanization, and population mobility. Seven teachers in all taught these students.

Grade Level: The 105 control and 120 project students were distributed over the following grade levels:

7th grade (5 students)	10th grade (22 students)
8th grade (5 students)	11th grade (34 students)
9th grade (73 students)	12th grade (86 students)

Measures: Writing samples were collected using the same topic for both pre and post-testing. The Emig-King Attitude Scale and the King Construct Scale (for students) were given both pre and post.

Writing Assessments Conducted:

HOLISTIC MEASURES

Topic: Write about an object that is really important to you, something that has become a part of your life. You might want to write about how you discovered it or what it has come to mean to you. You may write a journal entry, a letter, a story, a brief autobiography, an essay, or a poe

Scoring: A 1 through 4 point scale was used with each paper being read twice; thus a total score of from 2-8 could be achieved. Anchor papers were chosen by a team of readers from ETS to train the readers.

New Jersey Writing Project (continued):

Readers: No identification of the 20 readers is given; their experience with holistic assessment is not specified.

DATA ANALYSIS: A multiple regression analysis was performed with the post-writing scores as the dependent variable, and the type of group, SES, sex, and pre-writing scores, the independent variables.
Correlation coefficients were computed among the independent variables, including SES, teacher, grade level, type of English class and sex.

OUTCOMES: 1) The average mean increase of project students was .67 points (on the 2-8 point holistic scale), while control students dropped .20 points. The difference in the multiple regression analysis was found to be significant at $p \leq .0001$. This difference was considered even more significant in light of discrepancies in the post-test date: three of the project schools were tested in January (because they were on a semester system), while all the control schools had the full 8-month instructional period.

2) In addition, project students were found to be slightly younger and from slightly less advantaged SES backgrounds, although not at a statistically significant level of difference. SES was found to be a significant predictor of the pre-writing score ($p \leq .0001$), but in the multiple regression analysis, when controlled for pre-writing differences, SES had no effect on the post-writing scores.

3) Type of course was negatively correlated with post-writ scores ($p = .001$). In fact in all the courses dealing solely with writing, there was a drop in pre-post-writing scores, or they remained at the same level.

4) Grade level was not correlated with pre or post-writing scores. Females participating in the study received higher scores than did males; however, like SES, when controlled for pre-writing, sex had no effect on post-writing in the multiple regression analysis.

5) An interrater reliability coefficient of .72 was achieved for the holistic reading.

6) Using the Emig Student Attitude Scale, a study was made of differences between project and control students. Project students reported greater preference for writing and an increase in writing at the end of their English courses. They reported: engaging in more original, creative writing; writing more for school publications; writing more letters, increasingly using writing as an important way to express feelings, liking more what they write, increasingly preferring writing to watching television, and increasingly sharing their writing with

the class. Control students reported voluntarily revising what they had written more in the spring, viewing planning as more important, but spending less time on their writing and increasingly viewing grammar as important in learning writing.

7) Using the Emig Teacher Attitude Scale, a study was made of project and control teachers. Project teachers report spending more of their time writing, feeling a greater enthusiasm for teaching writing, valuing the content of student writing more than the correctness of grammar or spelling, and believing that it is not always necessary to learn to write a sentence before learning to write a paragraph.

LIMITS OF INTERPRETATION: This is a methodologically strong study. The finding of no gain for the control students after a year of instruction is surprising, however. As with all such studies, it is not clear what factors inside or outside the English classes, or during post-testing might have interferred with student performance on the writing sample, for control students more than for the project students.

SITE: Oregon Writing Project

CONTACT PERSON: Bob Olsen, Teaching Research, Monmouth, Oregon, 97361.

TITLE OF STUDY: An Examination of Certain Variables Related to Writing

DATES OF THE STUDY: Ten to twelve instructional weeks during Fall semester, 197

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY: Program evaluation for Title IVC funding agency

DESIGN OF THE STUDY:

Research Question: Will students of project-trained teachers gain more from pre to post on holistically scored essays than students of non-project teachers?

Student Population:

Project: Students of Oregon Writing Project Fellows in three school districts

Number: intermediate (gr. 4-6): Pre = 167 Post = 158

high school level: Pre = 300 Post = 217

**Control: students in one Oregon school district

Number: intermediate (gr. 4-6) Pre = 217 Post = 200

high school level Pre = 90 Post = 84

** No effort was made to match students on the basis of ability or course content. It was hypothesized that the control district was representative of education within the State of Oregon, but no supporting evidence was given

Measures: Pre and post essays on different topics

Writing Assessments Conducted:

HOLISTIC MEASURES

Topics: Four topics were used so that no student wrote on the same topic, pre to post. Topics were scrambled and randomly assigned so that all four were used both pre and post.

Topic 1: Imagine you have sent your younger brother or sister to the store to buy you some peaches for a snack. the grocer with whom you have known for years sends back some rotten peaches. Write the grocer a note saying what is wrong and what should be done.

Topic 2: Pretend that your friend has a hurt leg and will have to stay home for a long time. Write a letter to this friend that he/she would be happy to receive.

Topic 3: Write a paper telling how people become friends. Describe friendship or describe the qualities friends should have, or describe a friendship important to you.

Topic 4: Describe an object you are especially attached to and tell why you feel strongly about it, the way it came into your life, or the way it has taken on meaning through time.

Scoring: A 1 through 4 point scale was used, with each paper being read three times. No specific rubric was used; instead anchor papers were selected to establish the range of ability (1-4) at each grade level for each of the four topics. Separate readings were conducted for each topic at each grade level.

Readers: Thirty-seven readers were chosen, all with some experience in education, but not necessarily in holistic assessment.

ANALYTIC MEASURES

A stratified, random subsample of all the papers were also rated on the following: legibility/penmanship, the number of edits (or changes) which the student made on the writing sample, the number of paragraphs, the number of sentences, and the number of words.

DATA ANALYSIS:

Holistic: Analysis of variance was performed to identify significant differences pre to post between each group at each grade level.

Analytic: Differences were observed and commented upon, but not statistically tested.

OUTCOMES:

Holistic: No significant difference on post-tests between project and control students was found at the intermediate level; both groups gained a similar amount in mean holistic scores. At the high school level, the control students declined in their mean score; thus the project students scored significantly higher than control students. Because the instructional period of project students was shorter than that for control students by two to three weeks, it was hypothesized that project students would have scored significantly better than Controls, if they had been given the same instructional period.

Analytic: Because observed changes were not significant across groups and grade levels, they were discussed separately in the report, with no strong conclusions being drawn. Some of the analytic variables seemed consistently related to holistic scores and are to be examined in a subsequent report.

LIMITS OF INTERPRETATION: The following constraints on successful evaluation of the impact of the Oregon Writing Project on student skills were identified by the project. Because they apply to holistic evaluation of any of the NWP sites they are reported here.

1) The Project deals with a heterogeneous group of school districts, school teachers, and students.

2) Major elements of the NWP summer workshop do not lend themsleves to advance nor precise description.

Oregon Writing Project (continued):

3) The range and weighting of criteria which are considered most relevant to "good writing" are not held by concensus now among writing educators, nor is such a consensus likely to emerge in the foreseeable future.

4) Teachers participating in the NWP will differ in the intensity and enthusiasm with which they pursue the use of the instructional model and materials presented there.

5) The students ultimately impacted by the NWP have been, and will be affected by different teachers using differing techniques which have various degrees of fidelity to the intended NWP instructional model and materials.

All the above constraints were seen to limit the effectiveness of the present evaluation design. Another major weakness, acknowledged in the report itself, was the lack of a suitably matched control group. Plans are being formulated to replicate the study with more careful choice of a control group. In addition, the change in the number of students in all groups from pre to post is not explained.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SITE: Redwood Writing Project, CSU, Humboldt

CONTACT PERSON: Tom Gage, Director

TITLE OF STUDY: Evaluation Report by Dr. Alene McDonald

DATES OF STUDY: October, 1977 to February, 1978

PURPOSES OF THE STUDY: Program evaluation

DESIGN OF THE STUDY:

Research Questions: 1) Would students of project teachers improve on analytic measures of writing skill from pre to post?

2) Would students of project teachers score above norms of syntactic maturity for different grade levels (established by Kellog Hunt)?

Project: Students of Teacher/Consultants in Redwood Writing Project

Control: National norms developed by Kellog Hunt. Improvement was observed when February essays were compared to October essays.

Measures: Writing samples and sentence combining exercises were collected in October, 1977 and February, 1978 from 6th - 10th grades.

Writing Assessment Conducted:

ANALYTIC MEASURES

Scoring: 1) Average length of T Unit and number of simple sentences used to produce one T Unit of student writing - compared to Hunt's norms

2) Pre - post judged to be improving in spelling and handwriting

Topics: Give students the following titles and allow them 30 minutes to write a composition to go with the title. Titles are: "My Day in the Palace," "Robbie the Robot," and "Flight to Planet X".

OUTCOMES: 1) RWP students scored above Hunt's norms for average length of T unit in only one of the five grades tested.

2) Percent who improved on Hunt's norms and on ratings of handwriting and spelling were also calculated.

LIMITS OF INTERPRETATION: The evaluator concluded, "This is not a complete evaluation of student writing. The above information indicates that students are being taught to be better writers."
No statistical tests were performed nor was information given about numbers of students participating or standards by which improvement was judged.

SITE: St. Louis Writing Project, Webster Groves, Missouri

CONTACT PERSON: Judith Shook, Webster Groves High School, Webster Groves, MO 631

TITLE OF STUDY: IVC Interim Report: Better Teaching--Better Writing

PURPOSES OF THE STUDY: Program evaluation, IV C Evaluation

DESIGN OF THE STUDY:

Research question: Would students of project teachers demonstrate greater growth pre to post than students of non-project teachers?

Student Population: Students from 15 project high schools and an unnamed number of control high schools enrolled in courses having as a main objective the improvement of writing. Single essays were collected at the beginning and end of the courses.

Project: Students taught by one of the summer participants

Control: Comparison group used, but not described in report.

Measures: Pre and post-essays written on different topics.

Writing Assessments Conducted:

HOLISTIC MEASURES

Topics: Pre: In recent years there have been many complaints from employers, parents, and the media that high school graduates are poorly prepared in English. You are asked to be a member of a committee of high school students to find ways to help teenagers develop language skills. Write about one activity which you believe would help students read, write, or speak more effectively. You may choose an activity you have actually done in school or one which you think would be helpful.

Post: Imagine that next year the President announces that the country is facing a severe energy shortage. No new major sources of energy can be developed for several years. You are asked to be a member of a committee of high school students to find ways that teenagers could conserve energy. Write about one practical change that a teenager could make in his/her lifestyle to conserve energy. Use specific details and examples to make your suggestions clear.

Scoring: Developed by participants during the Fall 1978, it specified general characteristics of papers at each point level, on a 1-6 point scale. Each paper was read twice resulting in a possible point range of 2-12.

Readers: Not identified

DATA ANALYSIS: A student's t-test of statistical significance was performed for mean scores and gain scores of the two groups.

St. Louis Writing Project (continued):

OUTCOMES: A statistically significant difference was found between the post-test means of the two groups, with the project students scoring higher. However, the control group gained .13 more than the project group did from pre to post. No discussion was given of these findings.

LIMITS OF INTERPRETATION: No effort to check for differences in pre-post topic difficulty was reported. No explanation was given of the procedures used for matching the two groups.

SITE: Texas Hill Country Writing Project

CONTACT PERSON: Dr. Walter Lamberg, Director

TITLE OF STUDY: The Effect of Selected Conditions of Practice and Feedback on Elementary Student Writing

DATES OF THE STUDY: 1978 - 1979

PURPOSES OF THE STUDY: To compare the effects on "free" writing of two different kinds of writing stimuli -- verbally-stated topics and photographs.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY:

Treatment: All students wrote for 15 minutes, three times a week, for 10 weeks. In addition they completed pre-post-test exercises which took an additional two weeks; thus their total writing experiences lasted 12 weeks during the study. There were no restrictions or suggestions on mode of writing, but students were given a sequence of general subjects to write about. After each exercise, students counted the number of words they had written; this was considered self-provided feedback. There was no feedback from teachers or peers.

Research Question: How will type of stimulus (i.e. photograph vs. verbal topic) affect such aspects of students' free writing as fluency, correctness, and syntactic complexity?

Student Population: Subjects were divided into two treatment groups of 67 and 63, each with one class of second, third, and fourth graders.

Measures: Data were collected by measuring five pre and five post-treatment exercises, each entailing 15 minutes of writing. Both treatment groups were provided with copies of the same pictures, with a different picture used for each exercise. Counts were made of syntactic features.

Writing Assessments Conducted:

ANALYTIC MEASURES

Performance on each exercise was scored; then the scores were averaged for the set of five exercises from each student at pre-test, and for the five post-test writings. Counts were made of:

fluency: total words with and without errors
correctness: total correctly spelled words
correctly spelled words without other errors
total correctly punctuated sentences
total modifiers
syntactic complexity:
average number of words per T unit
simple sentences with two or more phras

Texas Hill Country Writing Project (continued):

DATA ANALYSIS: An analysis of variance with t-test was used to determine whether there were any significant differences between the groups either at pre or post-treatment, or whether there were significant differences in the gain scores of the two groups.

OUTCOMES: Conclusions were that "certain conditions of practice and feedback can have certain positive effects on the writing of elementary children: practice at a frequency greater than once a week, a variety of subjects, free focused writing, and self-provided feedback. Subjects for writing can be simply stated or illustrated in pictures."

Questions identified for future research included:

- Whether there are patterns of errors made in free writing by different grade levels
- Whether there was improvement in qualities of content and form
- Whether similar gains would be found with older students
- Whether the gains revealed in the free writing would transfer to compositions
- Whether there would be greater gains from peer feedback
- Whether there would be greater gains with a combination of free writing and sentence-combining practice

LIMITS OF THE STUDY: The study would be strengthened by testing students who did no "free writing" exercises, but whose classroom experiences were otherwise similar to experiences of the students in the study. As it is, changes attributed to pre-writing practice may have resulted from other aspects of the teaching program, or from natural maturation of students.

SITE: UC Irvine Writing Project, UC Irvine, Irvine, CA 92717

CONTACT PERSON: Carol Booth Olson

TITLE OF STUDY: UCI Writing Project Evaluation

DATES OF THE STUDY: Fall 1978 - Spring 1979

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY: Project Evaluation

DESIGN OF THE STUDY:

Project: Students of 6 out of 14 Summer Institute (1978) participan

Number: Senior high Pre = 169 Post = 169

Control: Students from 6 non-project teachers. Each project teacher selected his/her own control teacher as someone representative of the project teacher's own teaching style before the Summer Program.

Measures: In all, 1651 papers were scored. Two test essays were collected from all students at the beginning of the instructional year. Two similar essays (with new topics) were collected at the end of training. Half the students in each group wrote to expository topics and half wrote in the descriptive mode (pre and post).

Writing Assessments Conducted:

HOLISTIC MEASURES

Topics:

Descriptive

1) Write a paper with a beginning, a middle, and an end in which you describe the restaurant that you best remember. It could be the best, worst, or most unusual. Be sure to use at least three of the five senses in your description (sight, smell, touch, hearing, and taste).

2) Put yourself in a familiar place (a shopping center, busy street corner, a mountain trail, etc.) and write a paper with a beginning, middle, and an end in which you describe the place. Be sure to use at least three of the five senses in your description (sight, smell, touch, hearing, and taste).

Expository

3) Parents are responsible for the actions of their children. In trying to give a teenager the chance to begin to make his own decisions, parents face a difficult problem. Suppose you are a parent and explain the restrictions a good parent should put on a teenager who is living at home and tell the reasons for the restrictions. Give at least three examples and support them with specific details.

4) Suppose you are a teacher in a high school. What would you do to establish a good class? Explain at least three things you would do and tell your reasons. Be sure you identify the type of class you are teaching. Support your opinions with specific details.

Scoring: Raters used a 9 point scale. Each essay received two independent readings, with a resulting score range of 2 - 18 points. Readers were trained using anchor papers. Three hours training were given prior to the scoring. Participants scored separate training packets for the descriptive and expository topics.

Readers: Twenty teachers from local schools. All scorers were UCI Writing Project Summer Fellows.

DATA ANALYSIS: Post-test gains are greater for the project classes in 3 out of 5 groups writing to the expository topic. Post-test gains are greater for the project group in 3 out of 4 classes writing to the descriptive topic. Only mean scores were reported; no statistical treatment was available.

LIMITS OF INTERPRETATION: It is not known what methods were used by project teachers which were not also used by Controls. Although this matching of control with project teachers is an ingenious design, it is not known how similar the teaching of control teachers is to the pre-project teaching of the Summer Fellows.

SITE: West Virginia Writing Project, West Virginia College of Graduate Studies

CONTACT PERSON: David Harmon and Charlotte Pritt

TITLE OF STUDY: Evaluation Report

DATES OF THE STUDY: October 1978 - May 1979

PURPOSES OF THE STUDY: Program evaluation of product and process components

DESIGN OF THE STUDY:

Research Questions: (Questions, as stated here, reflect actual outcomes after attrition of sample and anomalies in data collection

1) Would students of project-trained teachers score higher than students of control teachers on post-test measures? (Only in grades 7 and 12)

2) Would students of project-trained teachers make statistically significant improvement from pre to post-testing? (Tested only for grades 9,10,11 regular students, and grades 7-9 remedial)

3) Would differences in performance by students of project teachers at different grade levels, (7,9,12) be statistically significant?

Student Population:

Project: Students of 7 out of the 14 participants of the 1978 Summer Institute were tested pre and post-instruction in the school year 1978-79.

Number: 18 students in all cells

Control: Students from nonproject teachers were chosen by rough matching procedure, using teacher characteristics, community characteristics, teacher assessment of student ability, and grade level. THESE STUDENTS WERE NOT TESTED AT THE BEGINNING OF INSTRUCTION, BUT ONLY AT THE END.

Number: 18 students in all cells

Measures: Single samples of student writing, collected in October and May for project students, and in May, only for control students. Scored holistically in pooled reading in May. Not reported if pre-post topics were the same or different.

Writing Assessments Conducted:

Topic: Not reported

Scoring: Raters scored papers on a scale of 1-6, giving each essay two readings for a total possible scoring range of 2-12. The interrater reliability was .74. Readers were led by Project directors.

Readers: Teachers trained at ETS holistic scoring workshop immediately prior to reading.

DATA ANALYSIS: A 3 X 3 analysis of variance was performed for grades 7 and 12, project and control groups.
Tukey and t-tests of differences in group means were performed for pre and post-test means of 9th, 10th, and 11th graders, and for 7-9th remedial readers, and for differences between 7th, 9th, and 12th grade project sutdents.

OUTCOMES: 1) Tests of differences between project and control students on post-test measures showed no difference for 9th and 12th graders. 7th grade project students performed better than 7th grade control students on the post-test, but 7th grade project students' pre-test mean was also higher than control post-test measure. The absence of pre-test data for control students means that post-test differences may result from initial differences of students.

2) Tests of improvement by project students from pre to post-testing revealed:
--- for 9th, 10th, and 11th grade regular students no statistically significant difference was found between pre and post-test means.
--- For 7-9th grade remedial reading students, post-test means were statistically significantly higher than pre-test means.

3) Tests of differences between project students at three grade levels, 7,9, and 12, showed differences at pre-test. Because 12th graders lowered their post-test scores, while only 7th graders improved scores, post-test differences between grades were insignificant.

LIMITS OF INTERPRETATION: It is difficult to make any interpretation of the data in the study because of the absence of pre-test measures for control groups. The differences between control and project group means on post-tests may be entirely a result of initial differences between students, and show no easily explainable pattern. The researchers also report motivation factors which may have affected the post-test performance of 12th graders who lowered their scores significantly.
The fact that the only gains recorded from pre to post-test occurred with 7th grade regular students and 7-9th grade remedial students, both of which groups would score initially at the lower end of the sample, suggests that regression to the mean might be a factor affecting post-test scores.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY OF NATIONAL WRITING PROJECT SITES 7/24/79

GENERAL INFORMATION:

1. _____

(project name and location)

_____ _____

(contact person) (phone number through Aug. 30)

2. How many Summer Institutes have been held by your project to date? (circle the appropriate response) see Table 2

1 2 3 Summer Institutes with the first held in 197___

3. Approximately how many teachers have been served through the Summer Institutes to date?

$\bar{X}$ = 46 Teachers have been served in Summer Institute(s)

4. A typical BAWP inservice lasts for approximately 30 hours. Please indicate the length of your "standard" inservice (# of hours).

$\bar{X}$ = 23 hours

5. Approximately how many "standard" inservices did you conduct during school year 1978-1979 and approximately how many individuals were served?

X = 8.3 "Standard" inservices in 1978-1979

X = 202 teachers served in those inservices

6. Approximately how many "standard" inservices did you conduct prior to 1978-1979 and approximately how many individuals were served?

X = 9.6 "standard" inservices held prior to 1978-1979

X = 154 Teachers served in those inservices

7. Please indicate the number and type of inservices held during the 1978-1979 school year differing from your "standard" model.

65% inservices lasting 1 session only (generally 1-3 hours)

percentage of sites making such offerings

53% inservices lasting from 2 to 5 sessions

27% inservices lasting from 6 to 9 sessions

27% inservices lasting 11 or more sessions

8. Which of the following offerings does your project provide? (check all that apply)

98% Summer Institute

17% Summer Open session for other interested teachers not included in the Invitational Institute

92% School year inservice

33% Other (please describe) see Table 1B

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS:

9. Please describe as fully as possible the following regarding the Summer Institute:

A. Criteria and/or process for choosing participants:

Recommendations solicited from: (specify) see Table 3

Interviews conducted by see Table 4

for the purpose of _____

_____

Important criteria for selection (rank order if possible)

see Table 5

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS: cont.

9. B. Length (# of hours) sessions held per day.

$\bar{X}$ = 5.7 hours per day (3:

C. Length (# of days) summer program lasts.

$\bar{X}$ = 21 days in program

D. Format (please estimate the percent of total time spent per week on the following activities:)

40% % presentations by participants
26% % writing by participants
10% % presentations by Institute leader(s)
14% % presentations by guests/experts
100 % TOTAL

10% % other (please specify)

see Table 8

E. Content: The following are issues and/or techniques and strategies commonly presented in BAWP programs. Please indicate the degree to which they are a part of your Summer Institute according to the following:

1= formally presented and discussed in session
2= mentioned and/or discussed, but not formally presented
3= not mentioned or discussed

percentage of respondents indicating a "1"

86% increasing the number of different types of student writing (46
98% teaching writing as a process through prewriting activities
78% teaching writing as a process through rewriting activities
96% use of peer response groups
53% increasing the amount of in-class time devoted to writing
61% increasing the number of in-class writing assignments
78% increasing the number of audiences who read students' work
94% increasing the variety of writing topics
96% increasing exploratory writing (free writing, journals, etc.)

F. Other techniques regularly presented, but not listed above include the following: (please be as specific as possible)

see Table 9

G. 70% % of the Summer Institute Fellows become inservice presenters and/or coordinators. (55-56

10. Please describe as fully as possible the following regarding the school year inservices:

Format (please estimate the percent of total time spent per week on the following activities:)

30% % presentations by participants
26% % writing by participants
30% % presentations by Inservice leader(s)
12% % presentations by guests/experts
100 % TOTAL

2% % other(please specify)

COST INFORMATION:

11. Regarding Summer Institute sessions, do participants receive a stipend? If so, please indicate the approximate dollar amount; if not leave blank.

$\bar{X}$ = $ 186 for each Summer Institute participant (2-5)

COST INFORMATION cont.

12. BAWP's Summer Institute is funded by the University of California, and its school year inservices are paid for by the district or school making the request. If you follow a similar model, please indicate the dollar amount you charge school districts to provide a "standard" inservice.

$\bar{X}$ = $ 1011 charged to districts for inservice (6-9)

If you do not follow that model, please describe here how your funding is handled for those programs.

13. The dollar amount (indicated in question 12) charged to schools for inservices covers the following: (please check all that apply)

percentage indicating that inservice charges to districts included these	
56%	coordinator's fees (10)
64%	speakers' fees
21%	all cost to the writing project central staff (including time in planning, correspondence, etc.)
43%	reproduction costs incurred during the course of the inservice
34%	all travel expenses incurred by speakers, coordinator and central staff to the inservice site
9%	refreshments
23%	stipend to the teacher/participants
9%	other, please specify (17)

14. What is the approximate cost per year to maintain your central staff? (regardless of the funding source)

$\bar{X}$ = $ 13,100 per year to maintain central staff

How many people does that dollar amount support?

Number of staff employees	0	1	2	3+
professional full time	84%	12%	4%	0%
professional part time	30%	23%	30%	17%
support staff full time	88%	9%	0%	3%
support staff part time	48%	43%	5%	4%

(24)

FOR SECOND YEAR SITES ONLY (those funded Summer 1978)

15. If you have considered it, what future sources of funding look promising for your project's continuation? (check all that apply)

percentage indicating a consideration of this type of funding	
38%	extramural grants or foundation support (specify source) (28)
	_____
48%	Title IV C
33%	State funds (specify nature) _____
10%	Federal funds (other Title programs, etc.) (Specify nature)
	_____
57%	Local School Districts
52%	University
	Other (please specify) _____ (34)

FOR THIRD YEAR SITES ONLY (those funded Summer 1977)

16. What sources of funding are being used during the third year of your writing project? Please be as specific as possible indicating the agent issuing those funds and the dollar amount received per year in each instance. (check all that apply)

18.2% grant or foundation support from _____ (35-39)

in the amount of $ 10,000 or more

27.3% Title IV C in the amount of $ 10,000 or more

9.1% State funds (specify nature) _____

in the amount of $ 10,000 or more

0 % Federal funds (other Title programs, etc.) _____

in the amount of $ 10,000 or more

9.1% Local School Districts in the amount of $ 10,000 or more

19.2% University in the amount of $ 10,000 or more

0 % Other (please specify) _____ (65-69)

in the amount of $ 10,000 or more

FOR ALL SITES

17. Rate on the following scale the potential your writing project has for becoming a permanent and ongoing program. (circle your choice)

1 Highly Unlikely	2	3	4 Don't Know	5	6	7 Highly Likely
3.8%	1.9%	3.8%	17.3%	19.2%	23.1%	30.8%

(70)

18. Optional:
If you have the time, the Evaluation Unit and the BAWP central office would be most interested in any other comments which could be included in our final evaluation report to Carnegie Corporation. Is there anything noteworthy about your project which has not been tapped by the previous questions? (ie. How is your project viewed in the University; in the community; in the state? Have participants in your project been successful in affecting change in writing programs? How extensive is that change? etc.) (Please attach additional sheets if more space is needed)

Appendix B

Evaluations Submitted from NWP Sites

NWP Sites Submitting Evaluations in 1978	Post Summer Inst. Quest.	Sum. Inst. Follow-up Quest.	Workshop Response Sheet	T/C Interv.	Student Writ Assessment	Report by Director	Report by Observer	Summer Inst. Tchr. Essays	Sch. Personnel Quest.	Inserv. Par. Essays	Effects of Diff. T/C Training	Inserv. Par. Quest.
Area III		X				X			X			
BAWP of Visalia	X											
Capital District	X											
N.Y.C.								X				
Oregon	X					X						
Prairie Sum. Inst.								X				
Prairie Fac. Wksp.										X		
S.E. Ctr. for Tch.W.	X		X			X						
UC Irvine	X											
West Va.	X					X						
Wofford	X						X					
NWP Sites Submitting Evaluations in 1979												
Area III					X							
Anchorage	X				X	X						
Colorado	X				X							
Gr. Phoenix			X	X			X	X				
Inland Area	X				X						X	
Montana	X	X				X						
Missouri	X		X			X						
Oregon					X							
Redwood					X							
Rutgers					X		X					
San Diego	X											
St. Louis	X				X	X						
South Basin	X											
Taft							X					X
Texas Hill Country					X							
Twin Cities Area	X		X									
UC. Irvine					X							
West Va.					X							
Wofford	X					X						

Appendix C

Item Analysis of Participant Evaluation of NWP Program Offerings

Positive Comments — 1978 Evaluations	New York City (17)*	Hofford (13)	West Virginia (16)	S.E. Ctr. (GA.) (n=?)	BAWP at Visalia (18)	Oregon (26)	Capital District (20)	Area III (19)	Prairie (summer) (19)	Prairie (faculty) (27)	UC Irvine (24)	1979 Evaluations	Missouri (28)	Twin Cities (25)	Anchorage (21)	Greater Phoenix (21)	St. Louis (25)	Taft (CA.) (n=?)
writing improved/enj. writing	11	3	5			+*		18	16	17	8			22		+	+	+
resource materials helpful	2		11							9			28					
writ./response groups helpful	10	+	8	+		+		3	15	2	18		28	23	18		+	
participant presentations help.	5		4			+			9	18	24			25			+	
staff well qualified	7	1	12		18		+		8	5	14		28	21				
sense of unity, socials	2	1	3		18	+			19									+
well organized format	1		9			+		12	7	12	5		28					
gained practical information	9	12	3	+	18			8	7	25	4			25	21			+
enjoyed guest speakers		2	9		18	+	+	7	8	20	24		28					+
enjoyed mix of levels (tchrs.)			1					4	4	16	6							
holistic assessment helpful					18			3		6	3			16				
high overall rating	+	+	+	+	18	18	+	+	+	+	+		28	25			21	+
expect student gains					18			17							20			
Negative Comments																		
need more discussion (of pres.)	3					+	+		5	11	3			19				
clarify writing assignments		4							4	4								
need for more theory					1			2		5								
need schedule of presentations	3	4	5			+			+	12	3							

* refers to number of participants in workshop

\+ exact number of respondents unknown

(Evaluations received beyond deadline were not included in the item analysis)